# DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 268 201 UD 024 808

AUTHOR Kogan, Deborah; Vencill, Mary

TITLE An Evaluation of the Favorable Alternate Sites Project. Final Report.

INSTITUTION Berkeley Planning Associates, Calif.

SPONS AGENCY Office of Refugee Resettlement (DHHS), Washington, D.C.

PUB DATE Oct 84

CONTRACT SSA-600-83-0163

NOTE 261p.; Tables contain light, broken type.

PUB TYPE Reports - Evaluative/Feasibility (142)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC11 Plus Postage.

DESCRIPTORS *Asian Americans; Employment Opportunities; English (Second Language); Job Training; *Land Settlement; Migration Patterns; *Program Design; Program Effectiveness; *Refugees; Relocation; *Social Services; State Programs; Welfare Recipients; Welfare Services

IDENTIFIERS *Arizona; Favorable Alternate Sites Project; *North Carolina; Southeast Asians

ABSTRACT

This final report describes and evaluates the Favorable Alternate Sites Project (FASP), developed in response to the oversettlement of refugees (particularly Southeast Asian refugees) in particular areas of the country. The project's goals were to reduce welfare dependency, increase the ability of FASP refugees to be self-supporting, and reduce emigration. The findings in this report are based on two-week site visits to Arizona and North Carolina in February 1983 and March 1984 as well as on interviews with various staff involved with the project. Following an introductory chapter, Chapters II and III describe FASP implementation in Arizona and North Carolina, including information on the states' role, the role of private agencies, job placement and vocational training, English-as-a-second-language classes, FASP resettlement versus other resettlement, and outcomes of migration and employment. Chapter IV analyzes the findings from the two states, concluding that a low welfare dependency rate was achieved in both states (less than 1% in Phoenix, 9% in Charlotte, 13% in Greensboro, and 27% in Tucson as compared to 82% for typical refugees in their first year). Emigration from the sites varied greatly (3% from Greensboro, 52% from Charlotte, 27% from Tucson, and 45% from Phoenix). The meanings of these findings are analyzed. The report concludes with a discussion of the influence of specific design features of the project on outcomes. Extensive appendices give information about the project workers and case histories of the refugees served. (CG)

***********************************************************************

* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *

* from the original document. *

***********************************************************************

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

- Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

ED268201

October 1984

# AN EVALUATION OF THE FAVORABLE ALTERNATE SITES PROJECT

## Final Report

UD024808

U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Social Security Administration
Office of Refugee Resettlement

# AN EVALUATION OF
# THE FAVORABLE ALTERNATE SITES PROJECT
## FINAL REPORT

March 30, 1984
Revised May 15, 1984
Revised May 31, 1984

Prepared for:

Office of Refugee Resettlement
U.S. Department of Health and Human Services
Social Security Administration
330 C Street, SW, Room 1229, Switzer Building
Washington, D.C. 20201
Toyo Biddle, Government Project Officer

Contract #SSA-600-83-0163

Submitted by:

Berkeley Planning Associates
3200 Adeline Street
Berkeley, California 94704

Deborah Kogan, Project Director

BPA Contract #157

This report was prepared by:

Deborah Kogan
Mary Vencill

This project has been funded with federal funds from the Social Security Administration, U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, under Contract No. SSA-600-83-0163. The contract, which was competitively awarded to Berkeley Planning Associates, is for a total contract amount of $38,263. The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Office of Refugee Resettlement, nor does mention of organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

I. THE FAVORABLE SITES PILOT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: NATIONAL BACKGROUND, DESIGN, AND OBJECTIVES . . . . . . . . . . 1

Resettlement Placement Patterns Prior to 1981 . . . . . . . . 1

The Development of a Refugee Placement Policy in Response to Geographic Concentrations . . . . . . . . . . . . 2

The Identification and Selection of Favorable Resettlement Sites . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 5

Evolution of the Favorable Alternate Sites Approach . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 7

II. FASP IMPLEMENTATION IN ARIZONA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15

Features of the Local FASP Sites . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 15

The State's Role in FASP Planning and Implementation . . . . 17

Local Actors and Responsibilities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 21

Social Services Available to and Utilized by FASP Refugees . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 23

FASP Resettlement Versus "Resettlement as Usual". . . . . . . 29

Characteristics and Experiences of the FASP Refugees. . . . . 35

FASP Outcomes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 47

The Importance of FASP Design Features. . . . . . . . . . . . 68

III. FASP IMPLEMENTATION IN NORTH CAROLINA . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 73

Features of the Local Fasp Sites . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 73

The State's Role in FASP Planning and Implementation . . . . 75

Local Actors and Responsibilities . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 77

Social Services Available to and Utilized by FASP Refugees . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 78

FASP Resettlement Versus "Resettlement as Usual". . . . . . . 84

Characteristics and Experiences of the FASP Refugees . . . . 92

FASP Outcomes . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 108

The Importance of FASP Design Features . . . . . . . . . . . . 129

IV. FINDINGS FROM THE FIRST PILOT DEMONSTRATION OF FASP . . . . . 137

The Success of FASP in Furthering Positive Outcomes for Project Participants . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 137

Observations on the Influence Of FASP Design Features on the Success of the Demonstration . . . . . . . . . . . . . 145

Lessons for Future FASP Resettlement Efforts . . . . . . . . . 151

The Success of FASP in Furthering The National Placement Policy Objectives . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . . 152

APPENDIX A: List cf Respondents, Arizona

APPENDIX B: List of Respondents, North Carolina

APPENDIX C: Detailed Description of Local Refugee Resettlement Actors and Responsibilities in Phoenix and Tucson

APPENDIX D: Detailed Description of Local Refugee Resettlement Actors and Responsibilities in Charlotte and Greensboro

APPENDIX E: Case Profiles of FASP Refugees in Arizona

APPENDIX F: Case Profiles of FASP Refugees in North Carolina

# I. THE FAVORABLE ALTERNATE SITES PILOT DEMONSTRATION PROJECT: NATIONAL BACKGROUND, DESIGN, AND OBJECTIVES

## RESETTLEMENT PLACEMENT PATTERNS PRIOR TO 1981

Through the individual and cooperative efforts of voluntary resettlement agencies, public and private providers of ongoing refugee social services, and providers of mainstream public assistance, social service, health, employment, and educational services, over 548,000 Southeast Asian refugees were resettled in the United States between 1975 and the end of Fiscal Year 1981, along with 174,000 refugees from Africa, Eastern Europe, the Soviet Union, the Near East, and Latin America.

Until late 1981, the initial geographic distribution of refugees to communities across the U.S. was determined as part of the initial reception and placement function performed by the voluntary resettlement agencies, as coordinated by the American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA). Once each national voluntary agency had been assigned its share of cases, choices about how to distribute refugees geographically responded to the availability and capacity of individual or congregational sponsors and of local voluntary resettlement agency affiliates to assist in the initial reception and placement process. Placement decisions were made in accordance with a policy of family reunification which placed newly arriving refugees in the same city as their relatives or friends. Other aspects of the local environment received little formal consideration, and state and local officials generally had no formal role in placement decisions or even in establishing overall refugee placement patterns. The attraction of cities with refugee population concentrations for new refugee arrivals was further evidenced by the substantial numbers of refugees who migrated to refugee population clusters in California, Texas, and elsewhere, drawn by combinations of factors including refugee concentrations, job opportunities, welfare opportunities, more extensive social service programs, and climate.

As a result of these formal placement practices, as altered by informal migration patterns, the population of Southeast Asian refugees in the United States by 1981 was heavily concentrated in a relatively small number of states (most clearly California, where it was estimated that over 40% of all refugees who entered the U.S. since 1975 resided) and within states, in a small number of counties. The National Association of Counties estimated in 1981 that 60% of all Southeast Asian refugees resided in only 40 counties in the country.

## THE DEVELOPMENT OF A REFUGEE PLACEMENT POLICY IN RESPONSE TO GEOGRAPHIC CONCENTRATIONS

Although concentrations of refugees and the phenomenon of secondary migration, in and of themselves, are not negative, it was becoming clear by the end of FY 1980 that the concentration of refugees in certain areas might be complicating refugees' chances for self-sufficiency (especially where these clusters occurred in local areas with a lack of plentiful entry-level jobs compared to the number of job seekers, and in states with relatively generous welfare benefits available to refugees who did not have an alternate means of support). In addition, there was an emerging concern that refugee concentrations might lead to strained relations with the public at large and with other minority groups who would, by necessity, compete with refugees for limited housing resources as well as employment. In response, the Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) in the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services, which had been assigned the responsibility for developing and coordinating a national refugee placement policy, established a Refugee Placement Policy Task Force on November 1, 1981. The Task Force, consisting of ORR Regional and Central Office staff, was given the mandate: (1) to define "adverse impact" areas for additional refugee settlement; (2) to specify how adverse impacts could be avoided through refugee placement policy decisions; (3) to develop alternate strategies to reduce negative impacts, and (4) to recommend which of these strategies should be adopted as part of ORR placement policy.

The Placement Policy Task Force identified a number of features of then-current refugee resettlement practices which were viewed as problematic:[1]

- In some local areas, family reunification cases were being sponsored by relatives who were themselves still welfare-dependent, thus reducing the ability of the new arrivals to avoid welfare dependence themselves.
- If free cases (i.e.,arriving refugees and refugee families without a spouse, parent, child, or unmarried sibling already residing in the U.S.) were placed in areas with concentrations of refugees, they were likely to face reduced job opportunities, whereas if they were placed outside areas of refugee concentrations, the absence of an ethnic support community tended to lead to high levels of secondary migration.
- Refugee placement decisions tended to give inadequate attention to local economic and housing opportunities, or to the level of community tensions regarding refugee resettlement.
- Refugee resettlement in low impact sites included no strategies to minimize secondary migration.
- Voluntary resettlement agencies were not always able to provide the ongoing support necessary to ensure achievement of economic self-sufficiency. If refugees were resettled in areas with on-site resettlement agency offices, these tended to be high impact areas, where jobs were hard to find. If refugees were placed in low impact areas, these were frequently localities without a resettlement agency affiliate field office, thus offering no protection if sponsorship breakdown occurred.
- Finally, in the absence of any special social service funding grant, states had a financial disincentive to accept additional placements, since their social service funding allocation took into account only refugees

already in residence at the beginning of the funding period.

Among the strategies devised by the Placement Policy Task Force in its concept paper dated December 31, 1981, was the strategy of reducing initial placements in impacted areas by:

- redefining "free cases" so that a higher proportion of all incoming refugees would fall into this category;[2]
- identifying "impacted sites" which already had concentrations of refugees and in which refugees would have a difficult time accessing needed services and obtaining employment; and
- no longer placing free cases in these impacted sites.

Closely related to this strategy was the strategy of developing new areas of resettlement with the capacity to accommodate the free cases which would now be ineligible for resettlement in impacted localities. The Placement Policy Task Force's report was not specific about how guided placement to new areas of resettlement should be carried out, but it mentioned the recently undertaken Khmer Guided Placement project as one possible model, along with the satellite placement model (i.e., placing refugees in nearby suburbs) and the reception center model (for which Houston YMCA's Welcome House was seen as a prototype). The Placement Policy Task Force Report also introduced the notion of using either positive or negative incentives to reduce secondary migration from low impact settlement sites.

By March of 1982, ORR had developed a draft Refugee Placement Policy, and was negotiating agreements on this policy between the Department of Health and Human Services, the State Department, and the voluntary resettlement agencies. The stated objectives of the new Refugee Placement Policy were:

(1) to reduce further adverse impacts on impacted communities;

(2) to strengthen the role of private nonprofit agencies in the resettlement process;

(3) to place refugees in communities with conditions favorable to attainment of self-sufficiency;

(4) to encourage coordination between public and private agencies involved in refugee resettlement; and

(5) to keep in mind the cultural integrity of the populations being resettled.

The strategy for achieving these objectives included the identification of impacted counties through development of a definition of impacted areas, which took into account the percentage of refugees to the total county population, the unemployment rate in the county, and the dependency rate for refugees who had entered the U.S. within the previous three years. The new placement policy also included a redefinition of free cases to include not only refugees without relatives in the U.S., but also refugees whose U.S. relatives were more distant than the most immediate family members (spouses, parents, siblings, or children). The Refugee Placement Policy also stipulated that:

- no refugee should be sponsored by a welfare recipient;
- voluntary resettlement agencies must maintain an "appropriate" capability in areas where refugees are placed; and — most relevant for this study, that
- ORR, the State Department, and the American Council of Voluntary Agencies (ACVA) should select a number of alternate sites for refugee resettlement, and undertake several pilot efforts to provide and use more concrete information about the circumstances and conditions likely to lead to successful resettlement outcomes in the alternate sites.

## THE IDENTIFICATION AND SELECTION OF FAVORABLE RESETTLEMENT SITES

Simultaneously with the development of the new refugee placement policy by the Placement Policy Task Force, ORR also formed an in-house workgroup which was given the task of developing a methodology for identifying "favorable resettlement sites." The Final Report of this workgroup, issued on December 21, 1981, included a rank ordering of Standard Metropolitan Statistical Areas (SMSAs) according to unemployment rates (ranked from low to high) and employment growth rates (ranked from high to low). An expanded community profile for each community where the unemployment rate was at or below the national average[3] included:

- estimated refugee population;
- the number of job openings in occupations frequently entered by previous refugees in that SMSA;
- increases in the local housing inventory between 1970 and 1980;
- renters as a percentage of total households;
- 12-month average rental vacancy rates;
- median fair market rents for a two-bedroom apartment; and
- a description of refugee social service funding in FY 1982 (including total dollars, caseload served, and service mix).

After completing these descriptive community profiles, the workgroup requested input from ORR regional staff as to the advantages and disadvantages of each proposed "favorable" site, with respect to voluntary resettlement agency capability, anticipated state interest and support, other nonquantifiable factors, and circumstances not revealed by examination of the statistical profiles.

The workgroup recommended, in an addendum to its report dated January 19, 1982, that two pilot sites be selected as first-year favorable alternate (FASP) sites, scheduled for implementation during FY 1983, and suggested that sites in Texas and New Hampshire might be most appropriate. In order to begin to solidify plans for the first two pilot FASP sites, ORR Central and Regional Office staff began to meet with State Refugee Program staff and local resettlement agency staff to describe the FASP program, describe the roles and responsibilities of the different actors, and gauge the level of interest or support for the idea at the potential sites. By April of 1982, the exploration of potential FASP sites had been broadened to include Norwalk, Connecticut; Raleigh/Durham, North Carolina; Fort Collins, Colorado; Denver/Boulder; Colorado; and Reno, Nevada.

During this negotiation process, ORR found that elected officials in some states were not interested in participating in the FASP program because the positive incentives were not powerful enough or because they saw the program as a political liability. Texas, in particular, declined to participate after lengthy negotiation. Finally, negotiations were concluded with North Carolina in August of 1982 for resettlement of 500 Cambodian refugees in Charlotte and Greensboro, and with Arizona in September 1982 for resettlement of 600 Vietnamese refugees in Phoenix and Tucson.[4] The demonstration in both states was scheduled to begin in January 1983.

In addition to negotiating with the pilot states, implementation of the FASP demonstration also required negotiations with the State Department and ACVA regarding the procedure of assigning free cases to FASP, and how overseas processing would be affected. While emphasizing that they could not guarantee that refugee processing would yield the desired number of free cases for FASP during the six months of scheduled arrivals, the State Department supported the program, and agreed to implement special overseas orientations to FASP refugees, using materials provided by ORR and the FASP sites. The national resettlement agencies, for their part, were concerned that FASP would eat into the free cases assigned to resettlement agencies not participating in FASP, and secured a commitment that all FASP free cases would come out of the allocations for the resettlement agencies participating in FASP. (In Arizona, this included Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services, the United States Catholic Conference USCC), Tolstoy Foundation, and World Relief; in North Carolina, participating voluntary resettlement agencies or "volags" included Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services and the USCC.

## EVOLUTION OF THE FAVORABLE ALTERNATE SITES APPROACH

The design features for the FASP approach built on the Khmer Guided Placement (KGP) project, which had taken place during the latter half of FY 1981 and the first half of FY 1982. As part of this first "guided placement" demonstration, approximately 8,000 Cambodian refugees had been settled in 12 cluster sites around the country, in an attempt to:

- increase the amount of communication and coordination between and among voluntary resettlement agencies, state and local social service providers, and mutual assistance associations in the resettlement process;

- establish stable refugee ethnic communities in the cluster sites to support the social, cultural, and economic integration of incoming refugees into their local communities and to reduce the level of secondary migration away from the cluster sites to impacted locations;
- encourage the development of mutual assistance associations (MAAs) which could play an important role in the resettlement process; and
- encourage rapid achievement of economic self-sufficiency among the newly-arriving refugees.

The Favorable Alternate Sites pilot (FASP) demonstration project thus represented the second generation of guided placement demonstration programs. Although the program's objectives were similar to KGP, the FASP design differed in several important ways from the earlier Khmer Cluster project. First, KGP had been hampered by the fact that the great majority of refugees arrived during a three-month period, straining the ability of the local sites to absorb this "bulge." Under FASP, refugees were carefully scheduled to arrive in a more constant flow over a longer period of time.

Second, KGP made little effort to involve state refugee coordinators in the advance planning for the demonstration sites. Under FASP, the state refugee programs were to be included as key actors in designing, pre-planning, implementing, and evaluating the placement of refugees in favorable sites. In addition, governor's approval was required before a FASP site would be approved by ORR.

Third, KGP had great difficulty supporting the development of viable mutual assistance associations in a number of demonstration sites and in developing a clear role for these demonstration-funded MAAs in the resettlement process. The FASP design was more flexible about how MAAs should be involved. Although the program encouraged MAA participation, FASP was not designed to include a separate set-aside of funds for MAAS.

Fourth, KGP sites had not been able to provide good data about the status of demonstration project clients, because of the absence of a centalized information system for tracking service receipt and employment or welfare status. In planning for FASP, ORR remedied this situation by requiring the local actors participating in FASP to periodically track refugee status and to feed these data into a centralized management information system to be used for evaluating program impacts.

The stated goals of the FASP demonstration project were to reduce welfare dependency and increase the ability of the refugees at the FASP sites to become self-sufficient. In addition, the program was intended to reduce outmigration to the lowest possible level. The major elements of the Favorable Alternate Sites resettlement approach, as envisioned by ORR, are described below:

(1) initial resettlement of free cases in communities with favorable labor market conditions and a strong private-public resettlement capacity;

(2) extensive collaborative planning by all participating agencies;

(3) clustered resettlement of a single ethnic or nationality group in well-defined geographic areas;

(4) pre-settlement orientation of FASP refugees in overseas refugee processing centers;

(5) the tracking of FASP refugees for 12 months after arrival and creation of a management information system (MIS) to incorporate tracking information;

(6) the implementation of ongoing case management to FASP refugees to ensure that refugees are provided with the supports necessary to achieve economic self-sufficiency; and

(7) the provision of supplemental ORR social service monies to pay for case management and MIS systems, plus other necessary social services.

Less definitive design issues, which may be susceptible to local variations or variations over time, include:

- how much supplemental social service funding is necessary to support FASP refugees (and provide states with an incentive to participate), and who is the appropriate recipient of these funds;
- what formal and informal role local MAAs and the larger refugee ethnic communties can best play in supporting the resettlement of FASP refugees;
- what is the "critical mass" for a successful FASP project, depending on how many refugees are already present at the FASP site, and over what time period should arrivals occur; and
- what exactly is meant by the case management feature of the program, and who should be responsible for it.

For the pilot FASP demonstrations in Arizona and North Carolina, ORR provided $250 per capita in supplemental social service funds, plus $25,000 to support the development of a state MIS system to track refugee progress over time.

In summary, the Favorable Alternative Sites resettlement approach is an integral part of the larger ORR refugee placement policy, which seeks to reduce the number of refugees placed in impacted sites and to increase the employment and other life opportunities for free cases by placing them in locations with good job opportunities and a stable refugee support community. Furthermore, the FASP demonstration sites are tests of whether refugee resettlement efforts will be improved if carried out with careful advance planning and extensive coordination between and among different actors.

## STUDY METHODOLOGY

The case study methodology utilized for this evaluation of the Favorable Alternate Sites Project combines the collection and analysis of site level data describing the local FASP sites and documenting the local project design, the sequence of FASP events, the responsibilities of different local actors, and project outcomes at an aggregate level, with the collection and analysis of client level data describing the characteristics of a sample of FASP refugees, and profiling the resettlement experiences and client outcomes for the individuals in the client sample at each local FASP site.

The findings in this Final Report are based on several two-week-long site visits to each of the FASP states included in this analysis — Arizona and North Carolina. The first site visit occurred during September 1983, as the last FASP refugees were arriving at each site, while the second site visit took place during February and March 1984, over a year after the first FASP refugees had arrived, and after the conclusion of formal project funding. In addition, data on national level program design and implementation were obtained from interviews in the fall of 1983 with Office of Refugee Resettlement (ORR) staff, State Department staff, and representatives of the national headquarters of the voluntary resettlement agencies which participated in FASP in Arizona and North Carolina.

During the intensive site visits, data were obtained from the following sources:

- written documents on FASP design and implementation;
- published statistics on local community characteristics;
- case file materials on individual FASP refugee households (for approximately 20 cases per site);
- interviews with state refugee program staff;
- interviews with voluntary resettlement agencies participating in the FASP demonstration;
- interviews with service providers for contracted refugee social services as well as mainstream services utilized by refugees;
- state MIS data on all FASP cases (from existing reports, or special purpose runs arranged with the state refugee program);
- informal discussions with five to ten FASP refugee families at each local site at the time of each site visit; and
- discussions with several sponsors at some of the sites which used an informal sponsorship system.

The following chapters describe the FASP activities and outcomes in the four FASP sites in Arizona and North Carolina. The last chapter of this Final Report attempts to draw conclusions about the effectiveness of the FASP approach and the importance of its various design elements, based on the implementation experience and documented outcomes.

## CHAPTER I FOOTNOTES

[1] From Concept Paper: Refugee Placement Policy, ORR, December 31, 1981.

[2] According to the taxonomy in use until mid-1983, the State Department categorized refugees in the refugee camps as:

> Category 1: refugees with immediate family already in the U.S. (parents, children, unmarried siblings);
>
> Category 2: refugees with married siblings already in the U.S.;
>
> Category 3: refugees with more distant relatives in the U.S.
>
> Category 4: refugees with refugee friends already in the U.S.
>
> Category 5: refugees with American citizen friends already in the U.S.
>
> Category 6: totally "free" cases (no friends or relatives already in the U.S.).

The expanded definition of "free cases" was to include all refugees in categories 4 through 6, plus a certain proportion of refugees in Category 3 (particularly where the distant relatives lived in an impacted area, and/or the incoming refugees were willing to be resettled anywhere in the U.S.). These newly defined free cases were recoded "6/3's" (i.e. a refugee with distant relatives willing to be resettled anywhere) or "6/4's" (i.e. a refugee with refugee friends willing to be resettled anywhere), etc.

[3] A total of 140 SMSAs were in this category, out of 323 SMSAs nationwide.

[4] Since the first round of favorable site review, ORR has evolved a procedure for site identification that is somewhat less rigidly "scientific," and more tuned in to political and programmatic opportunities and constraints. For a second round of FASP site selection which began in November 1982, ORR staff rated not only local employment characteristics, but also state interest. Virginia has begun a FASP demonstration project during 1984 as a Second Round FASP site. For a third round of site selection for FY 1984, ORR has issued a competitive grant announcement and is inviting interested states to apply.

## II. FASP IMPLEMENTATION IN ARIZONA

### FEATURES OF THE LOCAL FASP SITES

Tucson and Phoenix offered a number of advantages as potential FASP sites, including the presence of entry-level jobs, an existing Vietnamese community, affordable housing, and a number of resettlement agencies with a demonstrated capacity to successfully serve a sizeable number of new arrivals.

Arizona was one of the fastest growing states in terms of total population during the 1970's, with approximately a 4.5 percent gain in population each year from 1970 to 1980. However, since the onset of the current recession, state population growth has slowed, and the state has dropped from second place in annual population growth rate in 1980 (behind Nevada) to sixth place in 1981. In large part, this drop was due to a reduction in in-migration from other states. The total state population in July of 1981 was estimated at 2,794,000. Maricopa County, which contains Phoenix, accounts for an estimated 1,549,000 people, or 55% of the total state population, and Pima County, which contains Tucson, accounts for an estimated 550,000 people, or 20% of the state total.

The state population as of July 1981 was 82% White, 3% Black, 6% Native American, less than 1% Asian, and 8% reported "other."[1] Of the total population, 16% were of Spanish origin. In Maricopa County (Phoenix), and Pima County (Tucson), the ethnic composition is similar to this statewide profile, although the Spanish origin proportion in Tuscon is higher (21%).

According to the 1980 census, the mean family income in Maricopa County in 1979 (Phoenix) was $23,767 ($24,550 for Whites; $16,476 for Blacks; $17,400 for families of Spanish origin). Of the 400,084 families counted in 1979, 26,316 (7%) were non-elderly families with incomes below the poverty level.

According to the 1980 census, the mean family income in Pima County (Tucson) in 1979 was $22,112 ($23,046 for Whites; $16,604 for Blacks; $17,779 for families of Spanish origin). Of the 137,536 families counted in 1979, 11,044 (8%) were non-elderly families with incomes below the poverty level.

Employment forecasts prepared by the Arizona Department of Economc Security for Maricopa County in March of 1983 project that the occupational titles with the largest number of job opportunities during FY 1984 will be: managers, sales clerks, laborers and unskilled workers, secretaries, clerks, janitors, office clerical workers, electronics assemblers, waiters or waitresses, and other food service workers. A total of 57,258 job openings are expected to occur in FY 1984, which represents 9% of 1983 total employment levels. The comparable list for Pima County includes a similar list of occupations, including also nurses, stock clerks, truck drivers, and helpers in the trades. In Pima County, a total of 19,150 job openings (10% of 1983 employment levels) are expected to occur in 1984.

Although statewide seasonally-adjusted unemployment was at 9.9% in July of 1983 (compared to 9.5% for the U.S. as a whole) due to high unemployment in Arizona's copper mining regions, unemployment in both Maricopa and Pima Counties was below the U.S. average. Maricopa County's economy was the healthier of the two (at 7.5% unemployment), while Pima County's economy was limping along at 9.2% unemployment.

Previous experience with refugee resettlement in these two counties had already demonstrated that refugees could be placed into entry level jobs in these labor markets. However, the majority of jobs obtained by refugees started at the minimum wage, and job stability at the first job could not always be guaranteed.

Compared to other potential sites for refugee resettlement, Phoenix and Tucson offered several additional advantages. One advantage was the relative availability of rental housing at reasonable rents. The 1980 census indicates that Maricopa County had 183,411 rental housing units of which 12% were vacant, with a mean rent of $296. In Pima County, the census showed that in 1979 71,102 housing units were in the rental housing stock, of which 8,974 (13%) were vacant. Mean rents in

Pima County were $256. Furthermore, although it was not an immediate possibility for newly arriving refugees, the price of purchasing a home was much lower in Phoenix and Tuscon than in many metropolitan areas in the U.S.

Finally, both Phoenix and Tucson had existing Vietnamese communities, by virtue of previous refugee resettlement efforts, and had voluntary resettlement agencies with the demonstrated capacity to accommodate the estimated FASP refugee flows. Although no official figures are available, staff in the state refugee program office estimate that at the outset of the FASP demonstration in January 1983, Phoenix's Vietnamese community totalled approximately 2,000 individuals, while Tucson had a pre-existing Vietnamese community of about 1,200 individuals.

In summary, both Phoenix and Tucson appeared to be good risks for selection as FASP demonstration sites, because of the existing resettlement agency history and capability, the availability of entry level jobs, the availability of rental housing at reasonable prices, and the level of state and resettlement agency interest in the program. In fact, the one serious disadvantage, which caused some caution in approving Arizona as a FASP state, was the proximity of the two Arizona sites to California, and the magnetic attraction of California's generous welfare benefits for refugees in Arizona.[2]

## THE STATE'S ROLE IN FASP PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

In contrast to the predecessor Khmer Guided Placement program, which was implemented in most sites without much involvement on the part of state governments, the FASP design has emphasized the active involvement of state governments in both pre-project planning and actual implementation. In Arizona, that involvement and commitment was readily forthcoming, and was an expression of the state's interest in continuing to administer an active refugee resettlement program, with close coordination between and among voluntary resettlement agencies, contract social service providers, and staff of the state refugee program.

Although Arizona's refugee resettlement program has remained low key politically and legislatively, and is visible to the general public only to a limited extent, the State Refugee Coordinator (located within the Arizona Department of Economic Security) and other actors in refugee resettlement in the state have been very pleased by their past ability to achieve "quality" resettlement outcomes (i.e. rapid employment, low levels of welfare participation, and supportive services and anchor ethnic communities necessary to meet the needs of newly arriving refugees). They believe that Arizona continues to offer advantages over other resettlement sites due to (1) the widespread availability of entry level employment, at least in Phoenix and Tucson, (2) the low welfare benefit levels and absence of AFDC benefits for two-parent families (which provide a clear incentive for a refugee to select employment over long-term welfare dependency), and (3) the state's ability to offer 18 months of medical assistance on a "Medical Assistance Only" basis to individuals who meet income eligibility limits, rather than as part of an integrated welfare benefit package offered only to cash assistance recipients. It was hoped that selection as a FASP demonstration site would convince the national resettlement agencies to recognize the advantages of Arizona as a resettlement site, and would cause them to direct larger numbers of free cases to Arizona on an ongoing basis.

At the time the FASP project was being planned (the fall of 1982), the state also recognized that the FASP program offered the opportunity for the state's refugee social service budget to recapture, at least partially, funding cuts sustained between FY 1980 (when the social services budget totalled $700,000 and when the state had only 2,500 refugees) and FY 1983 (when the state was awarded only $350,000 according to the DHHS social service formula allocation, even though the total state refugee population had by then grown to over 5,000 individuals). Thus, the $150,000 in additional social service funding offered as part of the FASP package was a particularly attractive incentive to the staff in Arizona's refugee program, since it meant that drastic cut-backs in refugee social service programming could be delayed. Without FASP, it was also doubtful that the resettlement agencies in the state could have received enough new refugee arrivals, either as free cases or family reunification cases, to justify maintaining their resettlement staff at their then current levels.

FASP participation, then, was welcomed by the state government as a pro-active way to maintain their refugee program at its current level. The commitment to continuing refugee resettlement in Arizona was based on the conviction that the state offered refugees a good opportunity to achieve an economic livelihood as well as a desirable place to live and raise their families. Without FASP, drastic contractions that would erode the capability of both resettlement agencies and contract service providers to provide effective resettlement services seemed inevitable.[3]

In proceeding to plan and implement the FASP experiment, the State Refugee Coordinator and her office have continued to play a number of important roles, acting simultaneously as program advocate, facilitator, information system manager, and public relations representative. While not interfering with the operation of each resettlement agency in carrying out its own particular model of initial reception and placement services, the state's various roles have included:

- designing the available refugee social services to meet the needs of all refugees (including FASP refugees), by emphasizing
    - the delivery of job placement services by bilingual staff in special refugee programs within State Job Service offices in Tucson and Phoenix;
    - the delivery of ESL services to refugees by social service contractors in Tucson and Phoenix;
    - the funding of a refugee vocational training program (operating in Tucson only during FY 1983);
    - the funding of Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) contracts, in both Tucson and Phoenix, which are housed in a single resettlement agency, but which offer ongoing "social adjustment" casework services to all refugees; and
    - the delivery of work orientation services through contracts with mutual assistance associations (MAAs) in Tucson and Phoenix;
- convening a group planning process to design a computerized MIS system to be used to summarize the characteris-

tics of FASP refugees at the time of their arrival, and to document their subsequent receipt of social services and their achievement of employment outcomes;

- monitoring the submission of data to this system by resettlement agencies and service providers, entering these data into the computerized file and providing summary tabulations (and data dumps) back to each program for their own use;
- reconvening the planning group to decide how to modify the MIS system capability so that it will be able to construct summary profiles that will tell programs "something they don't already know" that will be useful for program planning;
- obtaining monthly data on the welfare participation of all refugees (including FASP refugees) and providing this information to the resettlement agencies so they can work to help these cases achieve self-sufficiency; and
- encouraging and participating in regularly scheduled FASP case review meetings in each site, at which all local refugee resettlement actors share information about the current status of each FASP case and plan service strategies to resolve problems and help each case reach a successful outcome.

In addition, the state is currently playing a key role (with active participation by other actors) in planning for "the next step after FASP," including such choices as whether the state should apply to be a FASP site a second year in a row and whether the state should try to combine participation in FASP with participation in a "planned secondary resettlement" demonstration, (i.e., to receive refugees who are currently living in impacted areas in the U.S. but who are willing to be resettled in Arizona). During 1984, the state is attempting to pursue both these options, with the active support of the resettlement agencies, as well as mutual assistance associations (who would play the most active role in the planned secondary resettlement project).

Through its involvement in FASP (and in ongoing refugee resettlement in Arizona in general), the state refugee program office has attempted to follow a self-conscious practice of building a consensus among all refugee resettlement actors, rather than dictating state policy. This practice appears to have worked well during the FASP demonstration, since it has permitted each resettlement agency to retain a sense of ownership in the program, while still encouraging the different actors to coordinate their activities with each other and view the program as a cooperative venture.

## LOCAL ACTORS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In each of the Arizona FASP sites, the primary agencies and organizations which were directly involved in refugee resettlement included:

- the voluntary resettlement agencies, each of which was responsible for initial reception and placement of its own clients; and
- the ongoing social service providers, which included, in each site
    - a refugee ESL program, located organizationally within the local public school system, but operated as an autonomous program;
    - a refugee job placement program, known as the "Refugee Job Service," operated by a special bilingual staff within the Department of Economic Security's Job Service field offices;
    - a refugee assistance program (RAP) located organizationally within the USCC affiliate in each site, but providing ongoing social adjustment casework to all refugees in the area; and
    - an MAA-operated project in each site offering work orientation to new arrivals.

Additional types of community actors who were important in each site included:

- providers of mainstream community social services utilized by refugees (e.g. bilingual public school programs for children, and adult basic education services for adults, and providers of health screening and other preventive health services available to low-income residents);
- formal or informal refugee associations or mutual assistance associations (MAAs), which helped out the resettlement agency staff informally, and were also formal service providers in both sites; and
- American "friends" who assisted the resettlement agency staff in offering a helping hand to refugee families during their initial period of adjustment, and who offered continuing support and friendship, in many cases, to the FASP arrivals.

A Description of the FASP Actors in Phoenix

In Phoenix, four different voluntary resettlement agency affiliates (with four very different styles of initial reception and placement) committed themselves to resettle FASP refugees. These agencies, together with their planned FASP commitment, include:

- Catholic United States Conference Social Services(USCC), 125 individuals;
- Lutheran Social Ministry (LIRS), 50 individuals (statewide);
- Tolstov Foundation, 125 individuals; and
- World Relief and Refugee Services, 125 individuals.

The actual FASP arrivals in Phoenix for each resettlement agency are summarized in Table 1 on page 36.

Additional refugee resettlement actors in Phoenix include the following state-funded refugee social service providers:

- the State Department of Economic Security's (DES) Refugee Job Service;

- Link Volunteers for Refugee Self-Sufficiency (Link V'FoRSS), the ESL program;
- the Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) housed at Catholic Social Services; and
- the Cambodian Association of Phoenix which had a one-year grant of ORR funds to provide work orientation training to all incoming refugees.[4]

Appendix C describes each of these actors in more detail.

A Description of the FASP Actors in Tucson

Compared to Phoenix, Tucson is simpler organizationally. Key refugee resettlement actors include:

- Catholic Community Services of Southern Arizona, the sole voluntary resettlement agency, which made a commitment to resettle 200 FASP refugees[5];
- the Refugee Education Project, which is organizationally a part of Pima County Adult Education, but is located in the same building as Catholic Community Services, and which operates the refugee ESL program, as well as a vocational training program for refugees;
- the state-funded Refugee Assistance Program (RAP), which is operated by Catholic Community Services;
- the Refugee Job Service, operated out of the North Side Job Service Office a few blocks from the CCS office; and
- the Tucson Refugee Consortium, a cooperative effort by a local Vietnamese association and two Lao associations, which received an ORR grant to provide work orientation to new refugee arrivals during 1983.

Each of these actors is described in more detail in the second half of Appendix C.

SOCIAL SERVICES AVAILABLE TO AND UTILIZED BY FASP REFUGEES

In both Phoenix and Tucson, a similar set of formal supportive services are available to all refugees, including FASP refugees. This section of the report summarizes the generic range of services, and summarizes the data available at the FASP sites about the extent to which these services have been utilized by FASP refugees. The services discussed below include:

- orientation, including both a one-day orientation for all new arrivals, as well as ESL survival English orientation (Phoenix only), and work orientation;
- Job Service placement services;
- refugee vocational training (Tucson only);
- ESL classes supported by refugee social service funds; and
- Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) services.

In both FASP sites, a great deal of information and support has also been provided to refugees by resettlement caseworkers, sponsors, and other volunteers.

### Orientation

The individual resettlement agencies reported that during the FASP demonstration project, a total of 584 FASP individuals had arrived in Arizona (366 in Phoenix and 218 in Tucson). In both Phoenix and Tucson, all newly arriving refugees were encouraged to attend a one day orientation session which introduced the refugees to their new homes, described to them the available services, and attempted to teach them basic skills, such as how to ride a bus.

In Phoenix, this one day orientation (cooperatively presented by all the resettlement agencies) was designed to be followed by one of two additional orientations -- either a week-long orientation in survival English taught by Link V'FoRSS (until a budget cutback ended this service), or a 20-hour long (over a two-week period) work orientation taught in the refugee's own language and provided by the Cambodian Association. No official statistics were available on the extent of FASP attendance at these orientation sessions, but several respondents commented that FASP refugees frequently obtained employment and started working before the end of this orientation period.

In Tucson, after the one-day orientation (which was operated cooperatively by the resettlement agency and social service providers), a 20-hour work orientation was also offered, and the Tucson Refugee Consortium's records show that between February 7, 1983 and September 3, 1983 a total of 174 students attended at least one work orientation session, of whom about 118 were FASP individuals. This suggests that Tucson's work orientation penetrated the FASP working age population rather completely, since only 206 FASP individuals in 89 cases had arrived in Tucson by September 1983 (only one FASP family arrived in Tucson after this date).

## Job Service Placement Services

During the FASP project, Job Service in Tucson provided services to 124 FASP individuals. Thirty-six of these clients ultimately moved away from Tucson, after they had been placed in one or more jobs by the Refugee Job Service. Of the remaining 88 clients who are still in Tucson, 63 are currently working at jobs obtained for them by Job Service or the Refugee Vocational Training Program, and another 11 clients are currently participating in the Job Corps after being placed there by Job Service. The Refugee Job Service in Phoenix reported that it had served 100 FASP clients during the FASP project, and had placed some of these clients in more than one job.

A statewide policy decision, implemented during 1983, limits access to the Job Service's refugee program to only those refugees who have been in the U.S. less than 18 months. This policy is intended to give priority to more recent arrivals, and force "older" refugees to learn to use mainstream social services, rather than always expecting to have refugee specific services available. Job Service supervisors were not very happy about this decision at the time it was made, because it excludes from the project's caseload those clients with the greatest chances to be placed in good jobs (i.e. those with the best English skills).

## Refugee Vocational Training

Offered only in Tucson by the Refugee Education Project, refugee vocational training was provided to 45 FASP refugees, who also received ESL instruction designed to fit the specific English language needs of their training positions. Forty of the 45 trainees were trained at actual business sites, where they began earning wages at the outset of the training period. Many of the employers who participated in the training program retained the trainees as regular paid employees after the end of the training period. Twenty FASP individuals placed by this project remained on the job at least 90 days. Others found new jobs more to their liking, or were laid off and were assisted in locating new jobs by the Refugee Job Service project.

## ESL Classes

Between January 1, 1983 and June 30, 1983, Phoenix's Link Volunteers for Refugee Self-Sufficiency (V'FoRSS) reported serving 334 refugees in its ESL program. One hundred seventy-nine of these (or 54% of the total caseload) were FASP clients. Although hard statistics are not available, there is a sense among resettlement agency staff and service providers that Phoenix's ESL program had some trouble reaching and, more importantly, retaining all FASP refugees in ESL classes. Various possible reasons proposed by service providers were:

- that refugees were so tired of being required to attend ESL classes every day in the refugee camps that they needed a rest;
- that refugees were too tired after working all day to come to ESL classes; and
- that the lack of transportation and child care were important barriers to ESL attendance.

The Tucson Refugee ESL Program reported that a total of 77 FASP refugees attended refugee-specific ESL classes offered by the Refugee Education Project during 1983. A number also attended English classes offered as part of Adult Basic Education programs at a community college.

## Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) Services

Statistics on the number of open RAP cases were obtained only for Phoenix's RAP program. For the two social adjustment workers serving Vietnamese cases in Phoenix, FASP cases far outnumbered any other cases. During 1983, a total of 70 FASP cases in Phoenix received RAP services.

## Ongoing Service Needs and Statewide Service Capacity at the Conclusion of the FASP Demonstration

One of the fears expressed by some actors at the outset of the FASP demonstration program was that the demonstration funding would last for only twelve months, whereas the FASP refugees would continue to require social services and other assistance beyond the demonstration period. Thus, during the return site visit to each FASP site in March of 1984, an effort was made to document both the current demand for services by the FASP clients who had arrived the previous year, and the ongoing capacity of resettlement agency staff and social service providers to meet these service needs.

An informal survey of resettlement agencies and other service providers offered a consistent picture of the current level of service needs among FASP refugees: although a number of FASP refugees still need occasional assistance with health problems, car insurance, legal problems, or other problems which require complicated interactions with U.S. bureaucracies, a surprising number of FASP refugees are now able to make it "on their own." A smaller number of FASP cases still need ongoing assistance resolving family problems, addressing serious health conditions, or achieving self-sufficiency.

For the most part, reception and placement staff had only infrequent contact with FASP refugees at the time of the return site visit in March 1984, and were concentrating most of their efforts on more recent refugee arrivals. RAP staff were continuing to work closely with those FASP cases who still needed ongoing assistance, but a smaller number of FASP cases were still actively receiving RAP services. For example, in Phoenix, a total of 35 FASP cases were still open in that site's RAP program. Since March 1984, the RAP staff in Phoenix can no longer offer on-site services to World Relief's FASP refugees in Tempe because of staff time and transportation constraints.

Although a few FASP clients are now "cycling back through" the Refugee Job Service for assistance in upgrading employment or finding a new job after being laid off, the initial job placement effort for FASP clients was successfully completed during the first 12 months of the project.

Finally, FASP clients are no longer attending Refugee ESL classes in large numbers. In Phoenix, a total of 30 FASP clients had attended ESL classes since January 1984. In Tucson, only six FASP clients have attended ESL classes offered by the Refugee Education Project since January 1984, but a number of FASP clients are attending Pima College ESL classes.

Some of the resettlement agencies have been able to maintain 1983 staffing levels due to continuing numbers of refugee arrivals who are family reunification cases or refugees from some other ethnic group. Some have had to cut back resettlement agency staff due to reduced flows. The World Relief and Refugee Services office in Tempe has shifted back to a congregational model of resettlement, with only a skeleton professional staff. With the exception of some family reunifications with FASP clients who already had relatives in the refugee camps, most reunifications have not yet involved FASP cases, although nearly every FASP arrival has close relatives who remained behind in Vietnam. Family reunification through the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) will be a long slow process for these families.

In summary, Arizona has been able to offer the same approximate level and range of refugee social services as was available during FASP to refugees statewide for the first half of 1984 with the hopes of being able to continue to support this level of program activity if either or both of the applications for another FASP project or the planned secondary resettlement project are funded by ORR.

## FASP RESETTLEMENT VERSUS "RESETTLEMENT AS USUAL"

### Overview

One of the key questions to ask in examining the implementation of the FASP demonstration in Phoenix and Tucson is "to what extent was resettlement during the FASP demonstration different from 'resettlement as usual'?" For most of the refugee resettlement that occurred as part of the FASP demonstration, this question can be answered as follows.

Key actors were aware that the FASP demonstration was occurring (although the FASP refugees themselves were usually not aware of this). FASP refugees constituted by far the largest group of refugee cases entering Arizona during the FASP demonstration period (January 1983 on), totaling from 60% to 95% of the total refugee flow for each voluntary resettlement agency during the first nine months of 1983. Furthermore, although FASP refugees did not have access to any special services, or receive any different treatment from other refugees resettled at the same time, the FASP demonstration did differ from "resettlement as usual" in the following ways:

- FASP represented a return for Arizona to a focus on new arrivals of Vietnamese refugees, after a two-year period during which most resettlement agencies had focused on resettling Cambodians (during the Khmer Guided Placement project in 1981) and then Poles (who were one of the largest refugee groups entering Arizona in 1982). Although the refugees in the state represent many different national groups (Laotian, Cambodian, Vietnamese, Polish), Vietnamese do constitute the single largest refugee resident group in both Phoenix and Tucson.
- Furthermore, the FASP refugees entering Arizona were not "typical" family cases. The largest number of FASP cases, (roughly 60% of all FASP cases statewide) consisted of single males. Most of these young men were between 19 and 35 years of age, and had left their entire families behind in Vietnam (for the younger men, these left-behind families were parents and siblings; for the older ones, they often

also included wives and children). Even the FASP "family" cases rarely included a nuclear family of parents and their dependent children. More often than not, the FASP refugee household with more than one person included family "fragments" such as two brothers and a cousin; or a woman, her two children, her husband's brother, and her nephew, etc.[6]

- From the service delivery perspective, the resettlement agencies and service providers were clear about the implications of this client mix. It meant they had to develop many more jobs and work with far more "heads of household" than they had anticipated when planning for a FASP demonstration which would include 600 individuals.
- The demonstration enabled the state to continue to expand its emphasis on rapid economic self-sufficiency through expanding funding for a coordinated package of social services. This essential package included ESL delivery (adjusted to work schedules), job placement, and (in Tucson only) a refugee vocational training program.
- The demonstration made Arizona actors aware that "the rest of the world was watching," and increased their commitment to being able to demonstrate successful outcomes for FASP clients. (In some instances, this was interpreted by Job Service Staff to mean that they were supposed to give priority to FASP refugees over other refugees in locating jobs; in most cases, it was interpreted to mean the need for energetic efforts to assist all refugees).
- The demonstration also imposed a new and different reporting responsibility on service providers and voluntary resettlement agencies, as part of the statewide MIS tracking design feature of the program. Although reaffirming the notion that they had to be responsible for ensuring that FASP refugees were experiencing successful outcomes throughout the 12-month follow-up period (and

for troubleshooting to solve problems that did occur), the new reporting requirement was also viewed as a nuisance because it did not immediately appear to be able to tell resettlement agencies or service providers anything they didn't "already know" from their manually maintained case records.

## How FASP Implementation Altered Resettlement Agency Practices in the Delivery of Reception and Placement Services

The primary effect of FASP on resettlement agency operations in Phoenix and Tucson was the need to staff up to meet the needs of a large number of Vietnamese new arrivals, after working largely with other ethnic groups (Cambodians and Poles) during the previous two years. The need to respond to a heavy flow of new arrivals over a six-month period also caused most of the participating resettlement agencies to emphasize and strengthen their volunteer service components. Full sponsorship by congregations or individuals was not seen as a feasible solution because of the large number of FASP arrivals, but most of the resettlement agencies worked out a combination of formal agency sponsorship, plus informal friendships or sponsorships of FASP refugees by American volunteer families or individuals.

The second effect of FASP on "resettlement as usual," from the resettlement agency perspective, was the greater emphasis on both case management and tracking. Under FASP, the resettlement agencies were responsible for tracking new arrivals over a longer period than usual (12 months after arrival) and for continuing to respond to problems that emerged as refugees adapted (or failed to adapt) to life in Arizona. This increased emphasis on documenting case status over time and being accountable for the ultimate successful adjustment of the FASP refugee arrivals was not different in kind from previous resettlement agency practices, but it heightened the "demonstration effect," i.e., the desire to prove to the world that Arizona was a good place for "high quality" refugee resettlement.

The final effect of FASP on resettlement agency practices was the increased coordination between and among resettlement agencies and service providers that occurred under the leadership of the State Refugee Coordinator. This coordination took the form of pre-demonstration planning sessions, group participation in design of the FASP MIS system, and regular interagency meetings, as well as FASP case review sessions to share information about specific FASP cases and their service needs. Once again, the types of interagency communication and coordination that took place under FASP were not new to Arizona's refugee resettlement efforts, but received particular emphasis under this demonstration program.

### How FASP Implementation Altered Refugee Social Service Delivery

In Arizona, the FASP incentive social service funding ($150,000) was not kept distinct from other refugee social service funds, but was instead used to strengthen the entire package of social services available to all refugees in the state. It so happened that during the time of the FASP demonstration, FASP refugees constituted the largest group using each of these services, and that service providers were very aware of the FASP program and its clients. The major impact of FASP, then, was to enable each local site to strengthen and expand its ability to assist refugees to achieve economic self-sufficiency through job placement assistance, work orientation, ESL, social adjustment services, and vocational training.

Participation in interagency FASP case review meetings kept service providers aware of which FASP households needed particular assistance to overcome difficulties they were experiencing.

### How FASP Implementation Altered State Refugee Program Administration

The previous section on the state role has already mentioned some of the key coordinative functions carried out by the State Refugee Coordinator and her office in terms of convening group planning meetings, administering the FASP MIS system, and encouraging and participating in the FASP case review meetings.

Perhaps the most distinct change FASP caused at the state administrative level was the design and implementation of the statewide FASP MIS system, which, it has turned out, has served as a prototype for an expanded MIS which will include all new refugee arrivals in Arizona (starting in 1984).

This does not mean that the FASP MIS experience in Arizona has been trouble-free. On the contrary, the initial design of the FASP MIS in Arizona concentrated on how case level data would be input into the automated system, and what the reporting responsibilities of each actor (each resettlement agency and each social service provider) would be, but did not pay much attention to how aggregate data summaries would be retrieved from the system. As a result, the only form in which data could be retrieved throughout 1983 was in the form of a "data dump" which reproduced individual case records, but did very little in the way of creating summary profiles of FASP cases on individual variables of interest. Moreover, the system lacked any capability to produce tables cross-tabulating several variables of interest (e.g., migration by case characteristics, or length of time until employment was obtained by case characteristics).

These serious barriers to the utility of the FASP MIS system are currently being addressed by the preparation of a series of computer programs that will enable the state to produce useful tables from the individual client records. The service providers and resettlement agencies have remained remarkably patient throughout this process, continuing to submit initial data entry forms on each new arrival as well as updates whenever a social service case is opened or closed.

Design and refinement of an MIS is a major undertaking, and it is not surprising that the developmental process in Arizona has been a gradual one. Critiquing an MIS is also a major undertaking, and one which cannot be adequately accomplished within the scope of this study. Nevertheless, from the point of view of its importance in summarizing the outcomes of the FASP program, the Arizona FASP MIS does appear to have several flaws, described below.

- Although achieving economic self-sufficiency is a primary goal of the FASP program, the MIS does not contain any information on household receipt of AFDC, Refugee Cash Assistance, Food Stamps, or Refugee Medical Assistance over time (e.g., case opening and closing dates, grant levels). Comparison of individual FASP client names with a statewide printout of AFDC, RCA, and RMA recipients on a case-by-case basis is necessary in order to review cash assistance utilization, and no summaries of such data are readily available.

- Because the MIS system depends on service providers to initiate data entries, there is a likelihood that the employment placement records do not include those jobs obtained by refugees themselves or with the help of their friends or American sponsors, if these jobs are not "claimed" as placements by the Refugee Job Service. Similarly, there is no safeguard to ensure that refugees who lose their jobs will show up on the MIS, unless they reopen a social service case with the Job Service to locate a new job. Thus, rather than offering an up-to-date comprehensive view of the employment status and job characteristics of all FASP refugees, the MIS offers a picture of the role of formal refugee job placement services in locating employment for FASP clients.
- Because continued entries in the MIS system are activity-initiated (i.e., when an event happens, it is reported), rather than time-initiated (i.e., a regular three-month or six-month follow-up), there is no way of telling how complete each case record is. (In contrast, if a six-month follow-up data entry were required, it would be easy to tell whether that entry had been made or was missing.)

Since the FASP MIS system has been such a big undertaking in terms of staff energies devoted to this project at all levels of the system, it is important to determine to what extent this activity has furthered the goals of the FASP demonstration. In the case of Arizona, it is noteworthy that the actors in the state refugee system remain committed to the concept of an MIS, even though they have not yet been able to make much use of the MIS as a management tool. For the most part, the summary statistics presented in this report were obtained from hand tabulated reports prepared by the resettlement agencies and service providers, rather than from data obtained from the statewide MIS. The MIS dump that was available appeared to slightly undercount both total FASP clients and secondary migrants, due to records not yet entered into the automated system.

## CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPERIENCES OF THE FASP REFUGEES

### Characteristics of FASP Arrivals

Information on the total number of FASP cases and individuals who came to Arizona is summarized in Table 1. Additional characteristics of FASP arrivals, such as age distribution, number of children versus adults, number of single person families, or date of entry, are not readily available in aggregate form from either the MIS data dump or resettlement agency paper records. Tables prepared by the state from the MIS data base will eventually provide these tabulations.

General impressions based on interviews with resettlement actors and FASP refugees themselves lead to the following conclusions:

- one large group of FASP arrivals consists of single young men aged 19 to 25 whose parents encouraged them to leave Vietnam to avoid being drafted to fight in Cambodia, which is occupied by Vietnam;
- another group of FASP arrivals consists of men in their thirties and forties, who were associated with the war effort in Vietnam, and whose families have not been permitted reintegration into Vietnamese society (FASP refugees talk about being sent to reeducation camps, being stripped of all their possessions, not being allowed to hold jobs, and children not being allowed to attend school);
- another sizeable minority consists of Vietnamese people of Chinese ethnic origin who have been subject to discrimination in Vietnam;
- families with children are often missing a parent who was

## Table 1

### Summary of FASP Case Composition

| Resettlement Agency | Total Individuals | Total Cases |
|---|---|---|
| **Phoenix:** | | |
| Catholic Social Services | 129 | 69 |
| World Relief | 83 | 58 |
| Tolstoy Foundation | 121 | 68 |
| Lutheran Social Ministry | 33 | 9 |
| Phoenix Total | 366 | 204 |
| **Tucson:** | | |
| Catholic Community Services | 210 | 91 |
| LIRS | 8 | 3 |
| Tucson Total | 218 | 94 |
| Arizona Total | 584 | 298 |

Source: Resettlement Agency Records

killed or caught during the same or previous escape efforts; and

- many households are composed of a number of young people with family connections within their same generation, e.g. siblings, cousins, brothers-in-law.

Even when the FASP refugees to Arizona had been students or had completed their education prior to 1975, they usually listed their occupation since 1975 as "fisherman" or "rice farmer." Urban dwellers sometimes described such marginal occupations as "street vendor," or "tire retreader."

The individual case histories of a number of randomly selected FASP cases in Arizona are included in Appendix E to provide the reader a flavor of the "FASP experience." The following generalizations are based on the impressions collected from reviewing the histories of these individuals and others like them.

## Family Composition

The types of families arriving in Arizona as part of the FASP program can best be described through the following varied but typical examples:

- a 24-year-old husband and wife with no children, who married while in the refugee camp;
- a 37-year-old man, and his two stepbrothers, ages 15 and 17 (whom his parents asked him to take when he escaped);
- a single 34-year-old woman, her 16-year-old brother, and her five-year-old nephew (the son of another brother);
- a single 29-year-old male, whose mother and three sisters are still in Vietnam;
- a 21-year-old single man, whose parents and siblings remain in Vietnam;
- a 50-year-old man, whose wife and children remain in Vietnam;
- a 31-year-old woman, who has been a widow since her husband was reported as missing in action in the war in

Vietnam, and her four children, aged seven, eight, ten and an infant. The father of her youngest child was resettled in Texas, but moved to Arizona to join her;

- a 34-year-old man whose wife and children were lost in another boat while trying to escape, and presumably perished;
- a 31-year-old woman, whose husband is still in Vietnam, accompanied by her two children and her husband's brother, age 20; and
- a 22-year-old woman and her 17-year-old niece and 17-year old cousin.

These examples illustrate the fragmented nature of the FASP households, both in terms of absent parents for young single people who would, under normal conditions, still be living with their parents and siblings, and absent spouses and children for many individuals who have married and formed families of their own.

The trauma of these prolonged family separations appears to be severe, though distinct in kind from the trauma of other groups of refugees who have experienced the death of many of their relatives (e.g., as is the case with many Cambodian refugees). For the Vietnamese refugees arriving in Arizona as part of the FASP program, there is a sense that life is still a process of waiting and remembering; waiting to find out whether relatives will be able to come to the U.S., and remembering the close ties left behind. As part of this separation experience, rapid employment is a much-sought-after outcome, because it is viewed as a prerequisite for sending money and gifts home to relatives in Vietnam, as well as for ultimately being able to sponsor left-behind family members to come to the United States.

A sizeable minority of the FASP refugees who came to Arizona had distant relatives already living in the United States. The importance of these distant family ties varied in importance from family to family. In one instance, a 31-year-old single man reported that he was angry with his relatives (who had been in California since 1975) for not doing more to help out his immediate family since the relatives departed

Vietnam. He has made no attempt to get in touch with these relatives since his arrival in Arizona.

In another case, two brothers, aged 32 and 20, chose to come to Arizona, even though they knew they had an elderly aunt living in another state. They arrived in Arizona and both obtained jobs, but were subjected to intense pressure both from their parents in Vietnam and from their aunt to move to join her. They finally moved to be with their aunt, four months after arriving in Arizona.

In a final example of the varying importance of distant family ties, a 21-year-old single man who arrived in Arizona and obtained a job within six days began to communicate with his 35-year-old uncle who lived in California. Finally, the uncle moved to Arizona to join his nephew and was assisted by the nephew's resettlement agency in finding a job.

## History Prior to Leaving Vietnam

As mentioned previously, the work and life histories of the FASP refugees tended to be very different before and after 1975, particularly for the older refugees. A few examples demonstrate this point:

- one 37-year-old FASP refugee had served in the Vietnamese Air Force and had received two years of training in the U.S. prior to 1975; after 1975, he spent six years in a reeducation camp, from which he escaped;
- a 31-year-old man had been in the army prior to 1975, and after 1975 supported himself by doing odd jobs;
- a 26-year-old refugee who had been a student prior to 1975 worked as a carpenter after the war ended;
- a 30-year-old man who had completed one year of college studying law prior to 1975 spent three months in a reeducation camp after the fall of Saigon, and then worked as a cook.

In contrast, many of the younger FASP refugees had entered the labor force since 1975, or, if they had been less identified with an

Vietnam. He has made no attempt to get in touch with these relatives since his arrival in Arizona.

In another case, two brothers, aged 32 and 20, chose to come to Arizona, even though they knew they had an elderly aunt living in another state. They arrived in Arizona and both obtained jobs, but were subjected to intense pressure both from their parents in Vietnam and from their aunt to move to join her. They finally moved to be with their aunt, four months after arriving in Arizona.

In a final example of the varying importance of distant family ties, a 21-year-old single man who arrived in Arizona and obtained a job within six days began to communicate with his 35-year-old uncle who lived in California. Finally, the uncle moved to Arizona to join his nephew and was assisted by the nephew's resettlement agency in finding a job.

History Prior to Leaving Vietnam

As mentioned previously, the work and life histories of the FASP refugees tended to be very different before and after 1975, particularly for the older refugees. A few examples demonstrate this point:

- one 37-year-old FASP refugee had served in the Vietnamese Air Force and had received two years of training in the U.S. prior to 1975; after 1975, he spent six years in a reeducation camp, from which he escaped;
- a 31-year-old man had been in the army prior to 1975, and after 1975 supported himself by doing odd jobs;
- a 26-year-old refugee who had been a student prior to 1975 worked as a carpenter after the war ended;
- a 30-year-old man who had completed one year of college studying law prior to 1975 spent three months in a reeducation camp after the fall of Saigon, and then worked as a cook.

In contrast, many of the younger FASP refugees had entered the labor force since 1975, or, if they had been less identified with an educated elite previously, had held less disparate jobs. For example:

- a 24-year-old FASP refugee had worked as a meat cutter and a mechanic;
- a 21-year-old single man had learned his father's skills as a silversmith;
- a 20-year-old man reported that he had no prior work experience;
- a 31-year-old man had worked as a welder and his 25-year-old sister had worked as a dressmaker;
- a 32-year-old man had worked as a rice farmer;
- a 20-year-old man had worked as a farmer and fisherman.

A number of FASP refugees in Arizona had completed a high school education in Vietnam, and some of these individuals, as well as others who had had contact with Americans during the Vietnam war, had a knowledge of English before arriving in the refugee camps. Among the most highly educated FASP arrivals in Arizona was a psychiatrist, who immediately obtained employment at minimum wage in a factory to support himself while he studied to become recertified as a physician. By the time of the return site visit, this individual had been hired by the resettlement agency to work as a refugee caseworker.

## Overseas Orientation and ESL Classes in Refugee Camps

Most FASP refugees to Arizona reported having been in the refugee camps (including both camps in first asylum countries and the orientation in the Refugee Processing Center) for ten months to two years prior to their arrival in the United States.

Although ORR is interested in assessing the effectiveness of special FASP pre-arrival orientation activities in the Refugee Processing Centers (i.e., whether FASP refugees were shown slides and provided with descriptions of their new homes while in the refugee processing center and what effect this had), it was very difficult to determine what exactly had taken place in the Refugee Processing center. What is clear is that even if they were provided with a special FASP orientation, FASP refugees coming to Arizona did not remember anything from that orientation . that made them aware that they were participating in a special project.

As will be discussed in more detail under the topic of migration outcomes, refugees seemed to be willing to promise a number of things in camp, if they thought it would get them to the U.S. faster (e.g. that they were willing to resettle anywhere, that they had no relatives in the U.S.).

Rumors which circulated in camp about Arizona were that it was a total desert, and that most of the inhabitants were cowboys and Indians. Thus, most FASP refugees were relieved to find that Phoenix (or Tucson) were real cities.

FASP refugees also heard two kinds of stories about California in the camps. One kind of story was that they should go to California to get on welfare. Most FASP refugees said they didn't listen to people who talked this way. Another type of story circulating about California was that "it is very crowded there," and that "there is too much crime there within the Vietnamese community." These stories seemed to be given great weight by the FASP arrivals in Arizona.

While in the refugee processing center, FASP refugees were also required to study English and to take a test to document their English language facility. While individual FASP arrivals covered the entire range of scores (from a low score of A to a high score of F) most of the arriving FASP refugees had level C or level D noted on their I-94 cards. Resettlement agency staff and service providers said that the exact ESL level recorded on the refugee's I-94 was not an accurate predictor of how much English the refugee could speak or understand on arrival. However, they said that FASP refugees and other refugees who have had access to intensive English language instruction overseas can speak more English when they come and progress much faster in ESL classes after arrival then earlier groups of refugees.

## Reception and Placement Services Received After Arrival in the U.S. from the Resettlement Agency

Across all the resettlement agencies and across both FASP sites, resettlement agencies placed the single males into clusters to share apartments upon arrival. Although some individuals complained that they wanted to be able to choose their own housemates, most FASP refugees seemed to get along well. Far from being too crowded when placed four individuals to a two-bedroom apartment, they usually invited one or two additional residents to share the apartment to save money when the rent became their own responsibility (when they obtained employment or when the reception and placement money was exhausted). The most populated home visited at the time of the site visit was a three-bedroom house in which 17 people were staying (though most of these were young children).

Often refugees would move into new apartments (sometimes en masse) when they obtained employment, in order to be closer to their place of work.

For those FASP refugees whose main reception and placement contact was a resettlement agency caseworker, the most frequent services provided by the resettlement agency were often the location of an apartment and assistance with the immediate necessities of daily living. This is not meant to imply that caseworker-refugee relations were uncordial, merely that they were focused around daily living needs.

For resettlement agencies which were able to identify congregations or individual sponsors or volunteers to befriend FASP refugees, the reception and placement process became more personalized, and real friendships developed between American families and refugee households. Among the activities in which refugees mentioned that their sponsors had included them were sharing their homes (for short or longer periods of time), home-cooked meals (often cooked by the refugees for their American sponsors), cultural and recreational activities, and "technical assistance" in shopping, learning English, getting a driver's license, furnishing their apartments, and making major purchases.

Nevertheless, a number of refugees reported at the time of the site visit that they mostly visited back and forth with other refugee households, although they also reported that they had made some American friends through their jobs. One FASP refugee, a 23-year-old single man, reported that he had become particularly close friends with his American coworker, with whom he works as a termite control sprayer.

## Social Services Received after Arrival in the U.S.

The preeminent social service received by most FASP refugees was assistance finding a job. A varied network of aids was used in this process, with the official Refugee Job Service project in each city being only one of several sources used to obtain employment. Other sources of job placement assistance included resettlement agency staff, volunteers or sponsors working with the resettlement agencies, the Refugee Vocational Education Project in Tucson, and other refugees. Those refugees with better English language skills could also broker jobs for themselves.

Aside from job placement assistance, the FASP refugees were very aware of the ESL classes offered in each city, although they did not always choose to access this service. It was difficult to obtain a candid response about why some refugees chose not to attend English classes. Reasons given by refugees were that the classes were too far away, or they were too tired after working. Reasons suggested by service providers and resettlement agency staff were that refugees were tired of studying English and needed a break after attending daily ESL classes in the Refugee Processing Center. Some staff also suggested that refugees wouldn't attend the refugee ESL classes because they were only offered four hours per week and refugees couldn't advance quickly enough. Nevertheless, some refugees went out of their way to attend ESL classes, even if they had a full-time job (e.g., attending ESL classes at night after working during the day, or attending ESL classes which are scheduled to be compatible with a factory shift which starts at 3:30 p.m.). Other refugees reported that ESL volunteers came to their homes to teach them English or to help them study for the GED exam. Others decided not to attend ESL classes, listened to language tapes on their own, or attended Adult Basic Education classes at a community college.

Although health problems do not appear to have been overwhelming for the FASP arrivals, the availability of Refugee Medical Assistance was a critical service in several cases and is seen as key to Arizona's ability to maintain refugees without enrolling them in cash assistance programs. In one instance, a FASP refugee who was almost blind in one eye received an implant operation paid for by the Refugee Medical Program. (The operation has improved his vision tremendously, and he is currently working for an electronics firm, making sample electronics parts.)

### Employment and Welfare Experiences of FASP Refugees

The FASP refugees most often expressed great pride in their employment and their ability to support themselves so soon after arrival in the United States. Occasionally dissatisfaction with a particular job was expressed, if it did not lead to career advancement, or if it involved work on a night shift which interfered with social contacts. The factory jobs were seen as "good jobs" when they offered the opportunity for amassing savings through overtime work, and as "poor jobs" when irregular work schedules and involuntary reductions in hours worked reduced the expected take-home pay.

FASP refugees who remained in Arizona most often expressed satisfaction at being able to support themselves. A number of households who openly expressed a desire to receive ongoing welfare support moved away to California. For the refugees remaining in Arizona, particularly in Phoenix, the resettlement agencies appear to have done a good job instilling the work ethic and an aversion to welfare in FASP refugees. Refugees frequently were able to say "I want to be self-sufficient," in English, even when this was beyond their normal vocabulary range.

### Refugee Satisfaction, Intention to Stay in Arizona

Because most of the FASP refugees in Arizona are so eager to be reunited with their other family members, they have a tremendous incentive to develop stable employment and a stable residential pattern in order to demonstrate their ability to sponsor their relatives. This helps explain why the single men, whom one might expect would be among the most mobile groups, actually tended to move away from Arizona less than more intact families.

Given their long-term goals, a majority of the FASP refugees appear to be satisfied with their situation in Arizona, at least for the immediate future. One choice which a number of refugees make several months after arriving in Arizona and locating employment is to move to a house of their own choice with housemates of their own choice. Often this living arrangement includes an even larger number of people than their original living situation, in order to further reduce rent costs for each individual. Often refugees living together will arrange carpools to share available transportation to and from work.

One of the most rapid "success stories" pointed to by resettlement agency staff is a FASP household of six people — a 32-year-old man, his wife, their two children (ages two and four), and the husband's two brothers, ages 17 and 18. Perhaps because this family is relatively intact, they are already planning to settle in Arizona permanently and are saving money with the hopes of ultimately being able to purchase a home. Except for a small amount of Food Stamps, they were already financially self-sufficient only four months after arriving in Arizona. The husband is working for an electronics firm at a job paying $4.50 per hour; the wife has two part-time jobs; and the 18-year-old brother is enrolled in the Job Corps, while the 17-year-old brother is attending high school. By the time of the return site visit, the wife in this family had obtained a full-time job working the night shift so that she could continue to care for her children during the day.

In terms of their physical surroundings, the FASP refugees said they were relieved that Phoenix and Tucson were cities, instead of a complete desert landscape with sand and cacti. Although they liked these cities, they complained about the heat (the first site visit took place in September, after a streak of hot weather when the temperature was over 100 degrees for weeks at a time).

The FASP refugees interviewed as part of this study reported that they were actively saving money, even with minimum wage jobs. They saved money to buy motorcycles or cheap cars ($200); they saved money to send presents home to family members in Vietnam; and they saved so that they would be able to sponsor additional family members to come to the U.S. A sizable minority of the FASP refugees (38%) chose not to stay in Arizona. The attractions of other locations included relatives, friends, the opportunity to escape family problems, the attractiveness of welfare benefits and educational opportunities in other locales, and business or employment opportunities. Most often these attractions occurred in combination, making it difficult to disentangle causes and effects. Migration outcomes are described in more detail in the following section.

## FASP OUTCOMES

### Description of Data Sources

The sources of data used to describe Arizona's FASP outcomes in this Final Report include:

- A "data dump" of the statewide FASP MIS system which covered all data entries input into the system through February of 1984. The individual case records included in this data dump were manipulated by hand to produce summaries of numbers and types of job placements (Tables 4 and 5). In addition, the names of FASP cases in the MIS system as of May 1983 were compared with computer printouts of all refugees receiving cash assistance to produce Table 8.

The information obtained from the MIS dump has the advantage of including all FASP cases, rather than a random sample. It has the disadvantage of offering somewhat incomplete pictures of refugee experiences and statuses as previously noted.

- A comprehensive effort to collect data on the experiences and outcomes of resettlement for a random sample of approximately 20 FASP cases in each FASP site (with proportional representation from each participating resettlement agency's caseload) including reviews of written case files, interviews with resettlement agency workers and social service providers, interviews with refugees, and a review of current cash assistance utilization data.

The information summarized for the random sample of FASP participants on Tables 4 and 5 and in the case profiles in Appendix E has the advantage of offering a complete capsule summary of the employment history and other resettlement experiences of specific individuals. It has the disadvantage of being based on a small number of cases, and thus having less statistical reliability.

- Up-to-date summaries of FASP caseload volumes and outmigration rates as of March 1984. For several key descriptors -- FASP arrivals and outmigration rates — we requested that the resettlement agencies provide us with an up-to-date summary of total FASP cases. These data were used to produce Table 2 on outmigration rates.

Thus, the sections which follow (on employment, welfare, and migration outcomes) are based on several different available data sources covering different numbers of FASP cases.

Migration Outcomes

Each resettlement agency knew that it was responsible for keeping track of and reporting the extent of secondary migration by the FASP refugees. As of the end of February 1984, the overall out-migration summarized in Table 2 had occurred. As shown in Table 2, this outmigration averaged 38% statewide (45% in Phoenix and 27% in Tucson).

One of the characteristics of the FASP arrivals that disturbed the voluntary resettlement agency staff was the fact that although they had been certified as "free cases" during the processing in the camps, a sizeable number of Arizona's FASP arrivals (perhaps 25-30%) did in fact have relatives (both immediate family members and others) in other cities in the U.S., most often in California. At issue are two questions: 1) Whether the refugees were appropriately classified as eligible for FASP resettlement if they reported that they had a relative other than an immediate member of their nuclear family in another city (e.g., an aunt, uncle; cousin, nephew, etc.); and 2) whether any significant number of FASP refugees did in fact have closer familial ties that they concealed from the J.V.A. interviewers in the camps in order to be able to come to the U.S. faster via FASP than they would had they requested family reunification.

State Department instructions under the new refugee placement policy were to classify as a free case any refugee who had a distant relative already in the U.S. but who stated that he or she was "willing to be resettled anywhere." Although this procedure may have resulted in identifying as FASP clients some refugees who had no intention of staying in Arizona, it also appeared to include in the program some

## Table 2

## Out-Migration from FASP Sites

| Resettlement Agency | Total FASP Arrivals | Number of Out-Migrants by September 1983 | % of Total Arrivals | Number of Out-Migrants by February 1983 | % of Total Arrivals |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Phoenix:** | | | | | |
| Catholic Social Services | 129 | 28 | 22% | 59[a] | 46% |
| World Relief | 83 | 30 | 36% | 37 | 45% |
| Lutheran Social Ministries | 33 | 14 | 42% | 19 | 46% |
| Tolstoy Foundation | 121 | 37 | 31% | 48 | 40% |
| Phoenix Total | 366 | 109 | 30% | 165 | 45% |
| **Tucson:** | | | | | |
| Catholic Community Services | 210 | 41 | 20% | 59 | 28% |
| Lutheran Social Ministries | 8 | 0 | 0% | 0 | 0% |
| Tucson Total | 218 | 41 | 19% | 59 | 27% |
| Arizona Total | 584 | 150 | 26% | 222 | 38% |

[a] This total includes two households (18 individuals) who moved in February 1984 after being in Phoenix for over 12 months.

Source: Resettlement Agency Records

refugees who truly did want to establish a new life independent of their relatives. Furthermore, in at least two instances noted in the case profiles, a refugee from another state (one from Texas, one from California) moved to Arizona to join their FASP relatives.

Interviews with voluntary resettlement agency staff suggest that the secondary migrants fell into several different groups. In one group were FASP cases who never really intended to give Arizona a try. They announced their intention to move to join relatives, friends from camp, neighbors from Vietnam, or previous American contacts immediately upon arriving, and usually had moved away from Arizona within three to six weeks after arrival. Table 3 summarizes information about the characteristics of the secondary migrants based on data prepared by each resettlement agency. As Table 3 shows, 37 of 144 secondary migrants for whom this information is available (26% of all migrants) had moved away within one month after arrival in the U.S. The procedure followed by the resettlement agencies in these cases was to contact the relative or friend, and verify that they would assist the refugee on arrival in the second location. In some cases, resettlement caseworkers said they were convinced the refugees would be better off in these new locations, given the level of support they would be receiving.

A second group whose members ultimately migrated away from Arizona were young single men whose parents in Vietnam and distant relatives in other cities exerted a great deal of pressure to convince them to move to join relatives.

Finally, over half of all those who had migrated away from Arizona by February 1984 left more than three months after their arrival in Arizona. Virtually all of these refugee households had already been employed in Arizona, and were often "stably resettled" from the perspective of an outside observer. One suspects that migration by this group was a deliberate attempt to improve the household's financial and social conditions by those who believed they would be "better off" in another state (most often California). Family and friends in other places were important in influencing the actual time and place of the move, but one important factor in many of these cases (even beyond the 18% in Table 3 whose official reason for migration was given as welfare) did appear to

## Table 3

## Characteristics of 222 FASP Clients Whose Migration was Reported by Resettlement Agencies

| | Cases | Individuals |
|---|---|---|
| 1. By Resettlement Agency | | |
| Catholic Social Services, Phoenix | 25 | 59 |
| World Relief, Phoenix | 25 | 37 |
| Tolstoy Foundation, Phoenix | 28 | 48 |
| Lutheran Social Ministry, Phoenix | 4 | 19 |
| Catholic Community Services, Tucson | 24 | 59 |
| Lutheran Social Ministry, Tucson | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 106 | 222 |
| 2. By Month | n | % |
| January 1983 | 0 | 0% |
| February | 8 | 4% |
| March | 21 | 9% |
| April | 15 | 7% |
| May | 17 | 8% |
| June | 16 | 7% |
| July | 35 | 16% |
| August | 23 | 10% |
| September | 24 | 11% |
| October | 10 | 5% |
| November | 5 | 2% |
| December | 16 | 7% |
| January 1984 | 2 | 1% |
| February | 20 | 9% |
| Unknown | 10 | 5% |
| Total | 222 | 100% |

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

| | n | % |
|---|---|---|
| 3. By Length of Time After Arrival | | |
| 1 - 10 days | 2 | 1% |
| 11 - 30 days | 35 | 24% |
| 31 - 60 days | 14 | 10% |
| 61 - 90 days | 21 | 15% |
| 91+ days | 72 | 50% |
| Total | 144 | 100% |
| Missing Data | 78 | — |
| 4. Family Size | No. of Cases | % of Cases |
| Single-Person Family | 65 | 61% |
| 2 - 4 Person Family | 30 | 28% |
| 5+ Person Family | 11 | 10% |
| Total | 106 | 100% |
| 5. By Reason Reported for Migration | n | % |
| To join relatives | 84 | 38% |
| To get on welfare or to get education | 41 | 18% |
| To join friends | 32 | 14% |
| Other, no reason given, unknown | 65 | 29% |
| Total | 222 | 100% |

(continued)

Table 3 (continued)

| | | n | % |
|---|---|---|---|
| 6. By State | | | |
| Moved to: | California | 154 | 69% |
| | Washington | 11 | 5% |
| | Massachusetts | 5 | 2% |
| | Georgia | 3 | 1% |
| | Ohio | 1 | — |
| | Florida | 1 | — |
| | Oregon | 4 | 2% |
| | Colorado | 5 | 2% |
| | Texas | 6 | 3% |
| | Louisiana | 6 | 3% |
| | Virginia | 9 | 4% |
| | Minnesota | 1 | — |
| | New Mexico | 4 | 2% |
| | Pennsylvania | 1 | — |
| | Kansas | 1 | — |
| | Utah | 2 | 1% |
| | Hawaii | 1 | — |
| | Iowa | 1 | — |
| | Missouri | 1 | — |
| | Unknown | 5 | 2% |
| Total | | 222 | 100% |

be the greater availability of welfare benefits and educational opportunities in California.

The out-migration from Arizona by those who were attracted by California's welfare benefits appeared to strengthen the resolve of those who have remained in Arizona to work hard and improve their own situation in Arizona. A number of those who have remained have changed jobs to a type of work more to their liking (most often electronics assembly). Many are working significantly more than forty hours per week, either through voluntary or mandatory overtime work. A number of families have two full-time wage earners, with one parent working day shift and another working night shift. One subset of those who ultimately migrated away from Arizona were the larger families (from six to ten or more individuals) or families with a single wage earner for whom even hard work couldn't equal the economic livelihood available through welfare in another locale.

The case profiles included in Appendix E summarize the detailed histories of some of those FASP cases who moved away from Arizona. The statistical profiles describing the 222 FASP refugees whose departure from Arizona was summarized from resettlement agency records (see Table 3) offer another perspective. As Table 3 shows, by far the largest group of secondary migrants who left Arizona (69%) moved to California. In a number of cases, the resettlement agencies said they had gotten inquiries back from welfare departments letting them know these individuals had applied for welfare. The Arizona agencies always answered these inquiries by reporting the fact that a refugee had quit a job to move away, if that was the case, but staff believed that this would only cause a one-month sanction on cash assistance eligibility. Refugees learned about this delay, and adapted their behavior accordingly. Thus, in one instance, a refugee reportedly "visited" California to apply for welfare, came back to her job in Arizona for the one month waiting period, and then moved permanently to California the month the welfare payments began.

## Employment Outcomes

In each of the Arizona FASP sites, the goal of rapid employment was taken for granted, and was accomplished in most cases. Because Phoenix had a substantially lower unemployment rate and a larger, more diverse job market than Tucson, the average length of time between arrival and getting a job did appear to be somewhat less in Phoenix than Tucson, but the comparison is between an average of about one month in Phoenix, versus two months in Tucson. (See the findings for the members of the FASP sample in Tables 6 and 7).

The data available for summary of employment outcomes as of March 1984 comes from two sources:

- the records on job placements in the statewide FASP MIS file, which represents a summary of the job placements obtained by the FASP arrivals entered into the MIS system. (The statewide automated MIS was recently expanded to include all refugee arrivals, not just FASP refugees. A cursory examination revealed that some of these individuals had been incorrectly coded as FASP cases, which might result in an overstatement of job placements in Table 4); and
- the employment experiences of a sample of approximately 20 FASP cases in each site selected randomly from each resettlement agency's caseload, as of March 1984.

The findings from each of these data sources will be described in turn.

Tables 4 and 5 describe the job placements recorded in the statewide MIS system as of early February 1984, which covered services provided and status changes recorded as of the end of December 1983. These jobs represent employment located by Job Service job developers, sponsors, or other agency placements. In Tucson, another important source of job placements was the Refugee Education Project's vocational training program, which placed 36 different FASP individuals into jobs at the conclusion of the training period.

As Table 4 shows, by the end of December 1984, 336 placements had been made to a total of 223 different individuals out of 584 FASP individuals (38%) and 298 FASP cases. Some jobs may have been entered in

## Table 4

## Job Placements for FASP Individuals Recorded in MIS System Covering Period Through December 1983

| Resettlement Agency | Number of FASP Cases | Number of FASP Individuals | Number of Noted Placements | Number of Individuals Placed at Least Once | Number of Jobs Above Minimum Wage | % of Jobs Above Minimum Wage |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| Catholic Social Services, Phoenix | 69 | 129 | 116 | 73 | 53 | 46% of placements |
| Tolstoy Foundation, Phoenix | 68 | 121 | 66 | 45 | 26 | 39% of placements |
| World Relief, Tempe | 58 | 83 | 39 | 23 | 26 | 67% of placements |
| Lutheran Social Ministry, Phoenix | 9 | 33 | 20 | 13 | 16 | 80% of placements |
| Catholic Community Services, Tucson | 91 | 210 | 92 | 67 | 38 | 41% of placements |
| LIRS, Tucson | 3 | 8 | 3 | 2 | 1 | 66% of placements |
| Total | 298 | 584 | 336 | 223 | 161 | 48% of placements |

the MIS more than once. It is not feasible, given the form in which data are recorded, to cross-tabulate the placements by date of arrival, in order to determine what portion of the jobs were obtained within one month, two months, three months, etc. of arrival in the U.S. The MIS placement listing summarized in Tables 4 and 5 is far more instructive as a source of information about the types of jobs and pay levels at which jobs were obtained. Although Table 4 shows that 161 of the 336 job placements noted (48%) were above minimum wage, the wages noted rarely exceeded $4.00 per hour. Table 5 shows that job developers (and sponsors and friends) attempted to tap the potential of some employers or types of industries who hired a number of refugees. These employers included a knitting company in Spring City (Phoenix) whose work force was about 80% Asian; an air conditioner assembly plant in Tucson, which hired a high proportion of the FASP refugees in that city, and a sofa bed factory in Phoenix. By the end of 1983, when the electronics industry was once again expanding in Tucson, one particular electronics company had also hired over 60 Southeast Asian employees. A significant minority of the single FASP refugees between 18 and 21 in both Tucson or Phoenix applied to and were accepted to the Job Corps where they are studying electronics, auto mechanics, nursing or an alternate job-relevant skill. (By December 1983, about 11 FASP refugees had entered the Job Corps from Tucson alone.) Other frequently obtained entry-level types of jobs included motel maid, restaurant work, and janitorial work.

Of the more highly skilled jobs, a number of FASP refugees wanted to get training in order to get jobs in the electronics area, and four FASP individuals had already obtained jobs in this area by June 1983. The number of FASP refugees working in this field had greatly increased by December 1983.

The second data base -- a review of the work history of the members of a random sample of approximately 20 FASP cases at each site (brought up to date to February 1984) -- permits a more recent view of such features of FASP employment as:

- the length of time from arrival to onset of employment;
- the number of employable household members, versus the number who had obtained employment;

## Table 5

## Types of Job Placements Recorded in MIS System Covering Period through December 1983

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| Job Corps | 10 | Electrician | 1 |
| Sewing Operator | 32 | Grocery Carryout | 1 |
| Furniture Upholstery | 8 | Florist Trainee | 1 |
| Furniture Assembly | 13 | Metal Worker | 1 |
| Product Assembler | 45 | Warehouse Worker | 7 |
| Construction Worker | 8 | Truck Driver | 1 |
| Seamstress, Tailor | 12 | Gas Station Attendant | 1 |
| Woodworking | 11 | Screen Printing Operator | 2 |
| Auto Washer | 1 | Electronics Technician | 2 |
| Stock Clerk | 22 | Cook Helper, Cook | 7 |
| Maintenance Janitor | 22 | Bakery | 7 |
| Dish Carrier | 4 | Yard Worker | 11 |
| Dishwasher | 5 | Termite Control Operator | 1 |
| Gardener/Landscapint | 5 | Power Tool Repair | 1 |
| Dry Cleaner Employee | 4 | Food Service, Restaurant | 8 |
| Salesman/Repairman | 2 | Cement Mason | 1 |
| Pottery | 2 | Electronics Assembly | 6 |
| Mail Sorter | 15 | Bicycle Repair | 1 |
| Beautician Assistant | 1 | Machinist's Helper | 1 |
| Housekeeping, Motel Maid | 14 | Auto Mechanic, Maintenance Mechanic | 2 |
| Body Shop Painter | 2 | Racker | 7 |
| CETA Training | 5 | Laborer | 18 |
| Manufacturing Tribal Moccasins | 1 | Winder | 5 |
| Farm Worker | 1 | Lead Former | 1 |
| Candle Trimmer | 1 | Lead Setter | 1 |
| Finisher | 1 | Turquoise Drill | 3 |
| Roofer | 1 | With Sponsor | 1 |

- the occupation and starting wage;
- who helped the refugee obtain the job; and
- whether the job had been retained at the time of the second site visit, or whether a new job had been obtained.

The jobs obtained were all full-time jobs, except as noted in Tables 6 and 7.

Table 6 summarizes the employment experiences of 22 randomly selected FASP cases in Phoenix (representing clients of all four resettlement agencies), while Table 7 summarizes the employment experiences of a random sample of 20 of Catholic Community Services' FASP cases in Tucson.

Phoenix

Table 6 shows that of the 35 employable individuals[7] in the sample FASP cases in Phoenix, (two of whom arrived later during the FASP year as part of family reunifications) all but one obtained employment within four months of arrival in Phoenix, and at least 15 obtained employment within one month of arrival. As of September, 1983, the one employable individual in the sample who had not obtained employment was a mother with four children, one of whom was a newborn baby. Her fiance had moved to Phoenix from Texas and obtained a job in an electronics firm and was supporting the family. This family migrated to California in October of 1983. Job Service was the primary source of employment assistance for all job finders in the Phoenix sample, except for clients of World Relief and Lutheran Social Ministries, who depended on resettlement agency volunteers to locate them jobs. Afterworking at their initial job for some time, several FASP refugees found new jobs more to their liking. Of the 35 employable individuals in this sample, five had held more then one job by February 1984. By February of 1984, seven of the 22 randomly selected Phoenix FASP cases had migrated in whole or in part to another state. A total of eleven employable individuals in the sample had moved. Individuals in five households had moved to California (two of these included large families with young children). In addition, one two-person household had moved to

**Resettlement Agency:**

- A - Lutheran Social Ministry
- B - Catholic Social Services
- C - World Relief
- D - Tolstoy Foundation

### Table 6

### Summary of Employment

### Random Sample of 22 FASP Cases in Phoenix

### January 1983 - September 1983

| Resettlement Agency | Number Household (Family Reunification Arrivals Added) | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Starting Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed at This Job? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| A | 2 | Male, 31 yrs. | Less than 1 month | Furniture Manufacturing | $3.35 | Lutheran Social Ministry's Job Mart | Yes |
|  |  | Female, 25 yrs. | Less than 1 month | Furniture Manufacturing | 3.35 | Lutheran Social Ministry's Job Mart | Yes |
| B | 10 | Male, 50 yrs. | 2 months | Maintenance | 3.75 | Job Service | No, quit, moved to CA (1/84) |
|  |  | Female, 48 yrs. | 1 month | Sewing | 3.80 | Job Service | No, moved to CA (1/84) |
|  |  | Female, 18 yrs. | #1:less than 1 mo.<br>#2: ? | Knitting factory<br>Electronics assembly | 3.80<br>3.75 | Job Service<br>Found job for self | No, quit, employed at Job #2<br>Yes |
| B | 2 | Male, 34 yrs. | Less than 1 month | Maintenance, resort | 3.50 | Job Service | No, moved to WA |
|  |  | Male, 21 yrs. | Less than 1 month | Maintenance, resort | 3.50 | Job Service | No, moved to WA |
| B | 4 | Male, 26 yrs. | #1:less than 1 mo.<br>#2: ? | Sewing operator<br>Warehouse man | 3.80<br>4.50 | ?<br>Found job for self | No, quit, employed at Job #2<br>Yes |
|  |  | Female, 31 yrs. | 3 months | Seamstress | 3.35 | ? | No, moved to CA (1/84) |
| B | 1 | Male, 20 yrs. | Less than 1 week | Metal plating | 3.35 | Job Service | No, fired in 11/83 |
| B | 1 | Male, 56 yrs. | #1:2 months<br>#2:2½ months<br>#3: ? | Sofa bed manufacturing<br>Making wood screws<br>Auto painting shop | 3.35<br>4.50<br>5.00 | Job Service<br>Found job for self<br>Found job for self | No, quit<br>No, employed at Job #3<br>Yes |
| B | 1 | Male, 25 yrs. | #1:2 months<br>#2: ? | Metal plating<br>Electronics assembly | 3.35<br>4.25 | Job Service<br>Found job for self | No, quit, employed at Job #2<br>Yes |
| B | 1 | Male, 44 yrs. | ? | Sofa bed manufacturing | 3.35 | Vietnamese Association | No, moved to Texas (9/83) |
| B | 6 | Male, 32 yrs. | 2 months | Electronics assembly | 4.50 | Found job for self (quit first job paying minimum wage) | Yes |
|  |  | Female, 30 yrs. | ? | Sewing factory, private tailoring | 3.50 | ? | Yes, factory job now full-time |
|  |  | Male, 17 yrs. | ? | Joined Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |
|  |  | Male, 18 yrs. |  | In high school | N/A |  | N/A |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 6 (continued)

| Resettlement Agency | Number in Household (Family Reunification Arrivals Added) | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Starting Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed at This Job? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| C | 1 + 2 | Male, 31 yrs. | 1 month | Electronics assembly | $3.50 | Resettlement agency volunteers found job | Yes |
| | | Male, 20 yrs. | Family reunification 10/83 | Electronics assembly | 3.50 | | Yes |
| C | 1 | Male, 20 yrs. | 1 week | Mailing service | 3.35 | Resettlement agency volunteers found job | Yes, now promoted to supervisor, makes $5.25/hr. |
| C | 1 + 3 | Male, 26 yrs. | 6 weeks | Mailing service | 3.35 | Friend working there found job | Yes |
| | | Female, ? yrs. | Family reunification in 12/83 | Piece work at home | | Resettlement agency | Yes |
| C | 1 | Male, 21 yrs. | 6 days | Making belt buckles | 3.75 | Resettlement agency | Yes |
| C | 1 | Male, 19 yrs. | 4 months (had eye operation | Electronic parts | 3.50 | Resettlement agency | Yes |
| C | 1 | Male, 50 yrs. | #1:1 day | 2 jobs: gas station attendant | ? | Resettlement agency volunteer | No, quit for job #2 |
| | | | #2:1 month | Electonics technician trainee | 3.35 | Volunteer | Yes |
| C | 6 | Female, 31 yrs. | Not employed | Babysitting for friend | | | No, started doing piece work product packing at home. Then moved to CA (10/83) |
| | | Male, migrated from Texas to join | ? | Electronics | 4.30 | Resettlement agency volunteers | No, quit to move to CA (10/83) |
| D | 3 | Male, 37 yrs. | 3 weeks | Electronics | 4.25 | Found job for self | Yes, now making $5.25/hr. |
| D | 2 | Male, 24 yrs. | 2 weeks | Oriental food market | 3.35 | Refugee found job | No, quit, moved to CA (10/83) |
| | | Female, 24 yrs. | 2 months | Sewing operator | 3.80 | Job Service | No, quit, moved to CA (10/83) |
| D | 1 | Female, 24 yrs. | 4 months | Drugstore clerk | ? | Friends found job | Yes (has worked another job in between) |
| D | 3 | Female, 34 yrs | Less than 1 mo. | Knitting company | 3.80 | ? | No, moved to CA (9/83) |
| | | Male, 16 yrs. | 2 months | Entered Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |
| D | 1 | Male, 19 yrs. | Less than 2 mo. | Transformer mfg. | 3.35 | Job Service? | Yes |
| D | 1 | Male, 21 yrs. | 3 months | Transformer mfg. | 3.35 | Job Service? | Yes |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Washington, and one single individual had moved to Texas. Of the households where some members moved away and some members stayed, the following situations occurred.

- An 18-year-old woman who was working in an electronics assembly job she had obtained for herself stayed in Arizona when the remaining nine members of her family moved to California in January 1984.
- A 31-year-old woman quit her job as a seamstress to move to another state with her two children while her brother-in-law remained at his job in Arizona.
- A 34-year-old woman responsible for her five year old nephew left her job as a sewing operator and moved to California where she says she will study English for one year and then return to Arizona. Her 16-year-old brother remained in Arizona, where he is enrolled in Job Corps.

Of the 24 employable FASP individuals in the 18 households from the random sample who were still living in Phoenix in February 1984, 19 individuals were employed at full-time jobs, two individuals were enrolled in Job Corps, one individual (who was a more recent arrival reunited with her husband who was a FASP case) was doing piecework in her home, and only one individual had been fired from his job and had not yet obtained a new job.

## Tucson

Although it took somewhat longer, on average, to find jobs for FASP refugees in Tucson, by February 1984, the employment situation was as gratifying as that in Phoenix, at least for the randomly selected cases (See Table 7). Of 28 employable individuals in 19 households in the random sample in Tucson, twenty-six individuals were still residing in Arizona by February 1984. Except for six individuals who had entered the Job Corps, two individuals who had recently quit their jobs, and one woman who is caring for young children at home, all the employable individuals in the sample were employed at full-time jobs as of February 1984. (In one 14 person FASP household in the random sample with eight

## Table 7

## Summary of Employment

## Random Sample of 22 FASP Cases in Tucson

## January 1983 - September 1983

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Entry Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed at This Job? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Male, 22 years | 2 months | #1:Termite control sprayer | $3.75 | Vocational Training Project | No, working at Job #2 |
|  |  |  | #2:Construction worker | 4.50 | Brother | Yes |
| 1 | Male, 21 years | N/A - moved away 5 weeks after arrival |  |  |  | Is working two jobs in GA |
| 3 (now 2) | Female, 22 years | #1: less than 1 mo. | Sales clerk | 3.50 | Vocational Training Project | No, laid off |
|  |  | #2: 4 months | Assembly worker | 3.55 | Job Service | No, now employed at Job #3 |
|  |  | #3: ? | Electronics Assembly | 3.35 | Found job for self | Yes, at Job #3 |
| 6 | Female, 44 years | Not employed |  |  |  |  |
|  | Male, 20 years | Within 1 week | Restaurant job | $650/mo. | Resettlement agency worker | Yes |
| 1 | Male, 29 years | 3 months | Assembly worker | 3.45 |  | Yes, now earning $3.85/hr. |
| 2 | Male, 19 years | 2 months | Furniture upholstery | 3.35 | Volunteer | Yes |
| 7 | Female, 32 years | 3 months | #1:Housekeeper at motel | 3.35 | Vocational training job | No, laid off, working at Job #2 |
|  |  |  | #2:Assembly worker | 3.45 | Job Service | Yes |
|  | Male, 19 years |  | Entered Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |
| 6 | Male, 35 years | Not permanently employed | Temporary yard jobs | N/A |  |  |
|  | Male, 20 years | ? | Entered Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |
| 1 | Male, 35 years | ? | Bicycle repair | 3.50 20 hrs/wk | ? | Yes |
| 3 | Male, 53 years | Several months | Unknown, several placements made | ? | Job Service | No, quit, moved to CA 1/84 |
|  | Female, 42 years | #1: 2 months | Housekeeper at motel | 3.35 | Vocational Training Project | No, laid off |
|  |  | #2: ? | Assembly worker | 3.45 | Job Service | No, quit, moved to CA 1/84 |
| 14 | 8 adults over 18 years of age (oldest 30) | Assorted; only 4 employed, only 3 full-time | 2 entered Job Corps; 1 working part-time at McDonalds; 1 handyman; 2 enrolled in electronics training | Asstd | Self-placed | Yes, assorted |

Table 7 (continued)

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Entry Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed at This Job? |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Male, 30 years | Several months | Assembly worker | $3.45 | Job Service | No, quit, moved to Phoenix |
| 4 | Female, 25 years | Several months | Jewelry store employee, 30 hrs/wk. | 4.00 | | Yes |
| | Male, 19 years | Not employed, attending high school | N/A | | | |
| 1 | Male, 20 years | 2 months | Electronics assembly | ? | Vocational Training Project | Yes |
| 1 | Male, 40 years | #1: 2 months<br>#2: ? | Assembly worker in plant<br>Caseworker at Resettlement Agency | 3.35<br>On Salary | Job Service<br>Resettlement Agency | No, employed at Job #2<br>N/A, studying to regain certification as psychiatrist/physician |
| 1 | Male, 39 years | 1 wk after arrival | Night custodian | 3.35 | Job Service | Yes |
| 6 | Male, 37 years | 2 months | Electronics assembly | 3.65 | Job Service | Yes |
| | Female, 32 years | #1:less than 1 mo.<br>#2:8 months | 2 part-time jobs: dressmaking and ½ time<br>Electronics assembly | 3.45<br>3.35 | Job Service<br>Job Service | No, now employed at Job #2<br>Yes |
| 1 | Male, 31 years | #1:less than 1 mo.<br>#2:less than 10 days unemployed | Bagel bakery<br>Construction work | 3.35<br>4.00 | Vocational Training Project<br>Job Service | No, laid off, employed at #2<br>Yes |
| 2 | Male, 30 years | #1:less than 2 mo.<br>#2: ? | Bagel baker<br>Electronics assembly | 3.35<br>3.35 | Vocational Training Project<br>Job Service | No, laid off, employed at #2<br>Yes |
| | Female, 20 years | ? | Joined Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |
| 6 | Male, 23 years | 1 month | Assembly worker | 3.35 | Job Service | No, quit, moved to Phoenix, moved back to Tucson |
| | Female, 46 years | Several months | Restaurant worker part-time | 3.35 | Job Service | Yes |
| | Female, 17 years | N/A | Entered Job Corps | N/A | Job Service | Yes |

adults over 18 years of age, a number of adults were enrolled in training programs, and working part-time.) In Tucson, as in Phoenix, a number of FASP refugees had changed jobs by February 1984, either to enter the electronics field, or to obtain a higher paying job or a job with more opportunity for overtime work.

## Welfare Outcomes

The resettlement agencies in Phoenix and Tucson consider both Food Stamps and the state's "Medical Assistance Only" program[8] resources which should be available to refugees without any welfare stigma. Unless employment is obtained during the first or second week after arrival, most refugees (including FASP refugees) are assisted by resettlement case workers or sponsors to sign up for these benefits. Because Food Stamps and the Refugee Medical Assistance Program are not stigmatized as "welfare," there has been no detailed attention to date in tracking utilization of these two resources by FASP refugees. Nevertheless, the costs incurred from these two sources are not negligible. The state estimates that its Refugee Medical Assistance Program costs roughly $1.2 million per year (for all refugees), while Food Stamp benefits received by FASP refugees in September 1983 ranged from $75/month for a single individual to $797/month for a family of 14.

As refugees obtain employment and increase their earnings, they "graduate" from eligibility for both Food Stamps and the Refugee Medical Assistance Program. For a household consisting of a single individual, a full-time minimum wage job is sufficient to disqualify one for both these benefits. For a larger household, medical program eligibility and Food Stamp benefits may continue to supplement earnings for a time. A review of the state's Medical Assistance eligibility log as of March 1, 1984, revealed that 163 FASP individuals were still certified as Medical Assistance eligibles at that time.

The primary data source on welfare receipt by FASP refugees is a computer printout produced monthly by the State Department of Economic Security, indicating how many refugees are receiving cash assistance, either as categorically eligible AFDC recipients or as RCA recipients. This is promptly provided to each voluntary resettlement agency to enable them to track refugee receipt of cash assistance and to ensure that jobs are promptly reported to the welfare department.

The difficulty in using this data source to analyze FASP receipt of cash assistance is that FASP refugees are not indicated on the printout. For the purposes of the present report, two analyses have been performed. First, the names on the January 1984 cash assistance report were compared against the names of all FASP refugees entered in the statewide MIS system. This analysis is summarized in Table 8, which shows that, as of January 1984, 43 of the 384 FASP individuals still residing in Arizona in January 1984 (or 19 of the 109 cases who were still residing in Arizona) were receiving cash assistance. This constitutes 11% of the 384 individuals, and 17% of the 109 FASP cases in the state as of January 1984. A summary of the January 1984 FASP cash assistance caseloads by site is shown in Table 8. Clearly, the FASP project in Arizona has succeeded in helping the vast majority of its clients achieve self-sufficiency while avoiding welfare dependency. The 17 FASP cases in Tucson who were still receiving AFDC for single parent households or RCA in January of 1984 include three large families with dependent children who are supplementing earnings with cash grants. (These three families account for 56% of all the cash assistance recipients in Tucson.) Another three AFDC cases in Tucson were receiving grants only for a dependent who was not the child of the responsible adult (e.g., for accompanying nieces, nephews, or cousins). In order to ensure that refugees do not continue to receive cash grants after they are no longer income eligible, Arizona recently centralized the process for refugee enrollment in welfare programs, so that a single state caseworker is responsible for processing all refugee applications and working with all refugee cases. This facilitates communication between the resettlement agencies, Job Service workers, and welfare workers about the current status of FASP and other refugee cases.

In Phoenix, resettlement agency staff have a more hard-line policy against utilizing welfare as a transition (unless there is no employable adult, or for a single parent family with a large number of dependent children or in case of serious illness or disability). Thus, there is a great deal of urgency about obtaining employment for a refugee before

## Table 8

## Persons Receiving Cash Assistance, January 1984

## Arizona FASP Refugees

| Location | FASP Residents as of January 1984 | RCA Individuals | | AFDC Individuals | | All Welfare Cases |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | | n | % | n | % | n |
| Tucson | 159 | 27 | 17% | 14 | 9% | 17 |
| Phoenix | 225 | 1 | 0.4% | 1 | 0.4% | 2 |
| Total | 384 | 28 | 7% | 15 | 4% | 19 |

the case's reception and placement resources have been exhausted. In Tucson, where the job market is tighter, resettlement agency staff will assist refugees in signing up for welfare as a transitional measure (but not until the end of the second or third month after arrival, by which time most cases have obtained employment).

### Outcomes on the Refugee and Larger Community in Tucson and Phoenix

Although FASP was implemented with low visibility in the general community (outside of the circle of dedicated sponsors and other volunteers), the project did breathe new vitality into the Vietnamese community itself in the two FASP sites. In Phoenix, the five different informal associations are beginning to talk about creating an umbrella organization to sponsor a Vietnamese social and cultural center. In Tucson, the MAA consortium helped to implement an electronics orientation course to assist their members in gaining entry into this growing employment field. A Vietnamese Mid-Autumn Festival held in Phoenix in September 1983 attracted hundreds of Vietnamese people from both Phoenix and Tucson.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF FASP DESIGN FEATURES IN ARIZONA

Some of the features of resettlement associated with the FASP demonstration program include: (1) resettlement of a relatively large number of refugees of a single ethnic group in a short period of time; (2) resettlement of free cases; (3) the selection of local areas with affordable housing and entry-level job opportunities; (4) the selection of local ares with existing support communities of the same ethnic group as the FASP arrivals; (5) the provision of special overseas orientation to the FASP refugees; (6) the infusion of extra social service dollars into the FASP sites; (7) collaborative planning and service delivery at the state and local levels; (8) the implementation of an MIS system for documenting program outcomes and facilitating individual case tracking; and (9) an added emphasis on case management services to ensure that FASP households in need of services are able to access those services.

In Arizona, it was not always possible to distinguish between resettlement as it was usually performed, and FASP resettlement. As previously mentioned, the features of the FASP experience in Arizona that distinguished this demonstration program from "resettlement as usual" included the arrival of a high proportion of single males, who required more job placement assistance than would the same number of individuals arriving in larger family households; and the greater cooperation and coordination among service providers and resettlement agencies, along with a sense of urgency about being able to demonstrate favorable employment outcomes for FASP clients.

From the perspective of observers concerned about the refinement and replication of the FASP approach in additional sites, the following lessons could be drawn from the experience of FASP in Arizona:

- The arrival of a large number of refugees in a short time period was stressful for resettlement caseworkers and social service staff, but appeared to be a cost-effective way to be able to offer intensive and comprehensive reception and placement services as well as social services. It was also very important to the success of FASP resettlement in Arizona that each of the participating resettlement agencies had a proven track record in handling similar volumes of new arrivals. Catholic Community Services in Tucson, with 200 scheduled FASP arrivals sometimes had a more frantic pace than the resettlement agencies in Phoenix, most of which had committed themselves to 125 FASP arrivals.

- The features of the local job market appear to be critical to the ability to achieve positive employment outcomes for FASP clients. Thus, Phoenix, with 7.5% unemployment in July 1983 and a larger number of job openings over the year, enjoyed noticeably greater success in placing FASP refugees in jobs quickly than did Tucson, which had 9.2% unemployment in July 1983 and a smaller overall pool of job openings.

- English language competency beyond basic survival English was not necessary for FASP refugees to obtain employment. However, some staff indicated that those who were advancing at their jobs were the individuals with better English language skills.

- The success in achieving economic self-sufficiency for FASP refugees is influenced heavily by family composition. Thus, for the single males who made up a high proportion of all FASP cases in Arizona, a minimum wage job with medical benefits was sufficient to enable an individual to become completely financially independent and to save money for sending to relatives or purchasing a car. (This is because a number of single individuals and small families chose to share housing units in order to reduce their living expenses.) In contrast, larger families with children tended to remain eligible for Refugee Medical coverage or Food Stamps even after obtaining one or sometimes two or more jobs per household.

- Although some FASP refugees with distant relatives did move away to join their relatives, others decided to stay in Arizona and even initiated some secondary migration into Arizona by their relatives. Thus, while it does not seem necessary to insist that FASP cases have no relatives in the U.S., it would seem desirable to more carefully screen refugees with relatives in order to determine what the likelihood is that they really intend to stay at the FASP site.

- The overseas orientation did not appear to have made much of an impact or impression on the FASP refugees arriving in Arizona. Refugees found it difficult to describe the FASP orientation or even whether it had taken place. However, it is difficult to tell whether this is because the overseas orientation was not often provided, or because the refugees were not able to absorb the information offered. FASP refugees in Arizona said they saw slides at the camp, but not slides which focused on Arizona in particular. The orientation materials (slide/tape shows) that had been prepared for overseas use were also utilized in the post-arrival orientations at the FASP sites, where they were perceived by service providers as being useful.

- The extra FASP social service dollars were perceived as an important incentive by the state, and without these funds there would have been difficulties in offering a comprehensive set of employment-oriented social services to new arrivals.

- Collaborative planning and service delivery improved the morale of the different refugee resettlement actors during this stressful time, and was important in making each agency feel some ownership in the program.

- The design and implementation of the FASP MIS system was an important activity in Arizona, but it is an investment which has not yet "paid off" in terms of providing information useful for program evaluation and ongoing management. Nevertheless, the concept of accountability, which the MIS symbolizes, has been key to the successful implementation of FASP in Arizona. Hopefully, improvements in programming flexibility will soon enable the MIS to achieve its potential as a management tool.

- Case management, i.e., ongoing assessment of client needs and the organization of an appropriate service response (structured troubleshooting) was important to the success of the FASP demonstration in Arizona. The regular interagency FASP case review meetings proved to be a particularly useful vehicle for facilitating interagency case management efforts.

- FASP refugees indicated that the preexisting ethnic support communities in Arizona had been important to the sense of satisfaction with their new homes. The evidence was that the ethnic support communities did not have to be formally involved in the resettlement process. In Arizona, they were involved in various ways, as volunteer individuals assisting new arrivals, as civic associations contacting FASP families or organizing community cultural events, and as MAAs, contracted to provide work orientation to new arrivals as part of the funded social service system.

## CHAPTER II FOOTNOTES

[1] These were some of the households of Spanish origin who identified their race as "other."

[2] In fact, prior to FASP, the USCC national organization had made a policy decision not to place any free cases in its entire Arizona/California region, fearing that they would migrate to California. The USCC affiliates in Tucson and Phoenix were relieved by the decision to participate in FASP, because that meant they could continue to resettle refugees in what they felt was a desirable location.

[3] The state was also smart enough to recognize that resettling free cases (with many relatives still in Vietnam) in the short term also offered the longer-term opportunity for an ongoing flow of refugees to Arizona in years to come, as family reunification efforts occurred.

[4] During 1984, the state contract for providing work orientation in Phoenix has been awarded to a Vietnamese mutual assistance association.

[5] Technically, LIRS was also a participant in FASP in Tucson. But since this local affiliate is located in Phoenix and only resettled three FASP cases in Tucson, and has only a very part-time staff person at the Campus Christian Center in Tucson, they tend to be overlooked as an actor.

[6] The implications of this particular type of FASP case composition are complex. On the one hand, one might expect single men to be more mobile than a family-based refugee population. Along the same lines, one might expect that the 19 and 20 year olds among the FASP single cases might be too immature to be concerned with stable employment. On the other hand, the one thing most of the Arizona FASP arrivals had in common was a strong desire to be reunited with family members who remained behind in Vietnam. In order to be able to ask for family reunification through the Orderly Departure Program, FASP refugees knew they would have to be able to demonstrate financial self-sufficiency.

[7] i.e., everyone over 18 years of age, plus 16 to 18 year olds who entered the Job Corps.

[8] Arizona has received a special DHHS waiver in order to operate its Title XIX-funded MAO program for refugees independently of the state's regular welfare/Medicaid programs. It considers this program one of its most powerful tools in preventing welfare dependency.

## III. FASP IMPLEMENTATION IN NORTH CAROLINA

### FEATURES OF THE LOCAL FASP SITES

North Carolina is the eleventh most populous state in the U.S., with approximately 5,875,000 residents.[1] As of 1974, with 115 persons per square mile, the state was twice as densely populated as was the U.S. as a whole.[2] However, over half of North Carolina's residents live in rural areas. The state population was growing at a faster rate than the nation, with about one-third of that growth due to in-migration. Charlotte and Greensboro are two of the three largest cities in North Carolina, with approximately 412,000 and 317,000 residents in their respective urban areas.[3] These figures represent, respectively, a 10% and a 6% growth rate over the past seven years.

North Carolina's per capita income ranked forty-first in the United States at $6,607 in 1978. However, both Charlotte and Greensboro show higher per capita income than the state average.

North Carolina has a large black population, about 22% of North Carolina residents compared to 11% of the U.S. population as a whole. Other ethnic groups, including Asians, are substantially underrepresented in North Carolina, though Charlotte and Greensboro tend to show more ethnic diversity than the rest of the state.

North Carolina had a relatively small number of refugees already residing in the state prior to 1983, though enough to constitute the beginnings of refugee ethnic communities in major metropolitan areas. North Carolina cities were not considered impacted areas, and there was no evidence of community tensions in the areas where refugees had been resettled. In all, about 6,000 North Carolina residents are Southeast Asian refugees; about one-tenth of those are Cambodian. Prior to the beginning of FASP, the Charlotte area had about 1500 refugees, of whom 160 were Cambodian. Greensboro's refugee population at the same time was approximately 500, with a Cambodian group of between 25 and 50.

Another large group of refugees was in the Raleigh-Durham area, and the remainder were scattered in cities and towns throughout the state.

Both Charlotte and Greensboro are located in the south/central part of North Carolina, an area of rolling hills and substantial agricultural and manufacturing activity. Both cities have adequate housing available at reasonable rents. Median fair market rent for a two-bedroom apartment in 1982 was $333 in Charlotte and $270 in Greensboro. These prices are about 5% above and 15% below the national average, respectively. Housing availability at first presented more difficulties for project staff in Greensboro than in Charlotte. In Charlotte, Catholic Social Services (CSS) staff had developed a good working relationship with the management of two moderately priced housing complexes in which vacant apartments were readily available. (However, in the largest apartment complex, management recently declined to renew any of the FASP refugees' leases, so that the housing arrangements in the two cities are now quite similar.) In Greensboro, each new arrival occasioned a housing search, though Lutheran Family Services (LFS) staff have worked closely with a number of realtors and apartment owners. The decision in Greensboro not to settle refugees in a single neighborhood was a conscious one, designed to minimize the visibility (and thus the potential tension within the community) of the Cambodian group, and designed to allow them to get to know American neighbors.

Both Charlotte and Greensboro have low unemployment rates (averaging one to two percentage points lower than the national rate over the past five years) and a reasonable number of available entry-level jobs. In Charlotte, the textile industry has been the source of numerous jobs for FASP refugees, while in Greensboro, the majority of jobs have been in furniture manufacturing and related industries. Entry-level jobs in service occupations have also been relatively easy to find in both cities, and high technology firms are being approached with increasing success. There has emerged a feeling among employers in these cities that refugees will accept and excel in jobs which many American workers don't want, and thus employers are receptive to job development efforts by program staff.

The selection of North Carolina for a FASP demonstration and the designation of Charlotte and Greensboro as project sites appeared compatible with the goals of FASP. Both are low-impact sites with available housing and employment opportunities and with demonstrated resettlement capabilities. The solid track record of the two primary voluntary resettlement agencies chosen for FASP in North Carolina indicated that the capability to undertake "cluster" resettlement was present. In addition, one of the proposed sites had resettled a small group of Cambodian families during 1981. Finally, North Carolina had one of the lowest refugee cash assistance dependency rates among the ORR Region IV states, and among the lowest nationwide.

## THE STATE'S ROLE IN FASP PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION

The state coordinator's response to the possibility of implementing FASP in North Carolina was quite simple: if the voluntary resettlement agencies were in favor of undertaking the program, the state would support them in their efforts. The state would neither urge nor discourage the undertaking of FASP.

Initially, ORR had proposed that 750 Vietnamese refugees be resettled in North Carolina, all in Charlotte, where Catholic Social Services had the largest social services contract in the state. In discussions with the state coordinator and ORR officials, several North Carolina resettlement workers urged that consideration be given to working instead with a group of Cambodian refugees, partly because of the large number of Cambodian free case refugees remaining in the overseas camp, and partly because these refugees had proved cooperative and successful in prior resettlement efforts. A further departure from the original FASP proposal for North Carolina was based upon the realistic judgment that no single agency or community could effectively resettle the large number of refugees initially proposed within the first six months of 1983. After some negotiation, ORR agreed to two solutions: (1) that the FASP project be split into two sites, one to be located in Charlotte as planned, the other to be located in Greensboro and resettled by Lutheran Family Services, and (2) that the total number be reduced to 500 Cambodian refugees, about 300 to go to Charlotte and the remaining 200 to Greensboro.

This new plan required that additional funding be allocated to Lutheran Family Services (LFS) in Greensboro, since they did not have an existing state social services contract.[4] Though they had been involved in initial resettlement of refugees for some time, through congregational sponsorships, they did not have sufficient staff to provide the wide range of social services and case management needed for FASP, and therefore needed significant resources to expand their paid staff . Therefore, it was agreed by all parties that LFS should receive about two-thirds of the state's FASP social services allocation, though they were to be responsible for resettling only 40% of the FASP refugees.

The North Carolina State Refugee Coordinator remained supportive throughout the implementation phase of the FASP project. His role in implementation, in cooperation with the ORR Region IV Director, was to design the management information/refugee tracking system to be used to document FASP refugee characteristics and outcomes, to assist in solving problems that emerged in the two FASP cities, and to monitor the two agencies. He also served as an active supporter of the two agencies. Ongoing refugee assistance (RAP) contracts were signed with both agencies after the conclusion of the FASP demonstration, though necessarily at a reduced funding level, to enable them to continue providing services to the recently-resettled FASP refugees. In the State Refugee Coordinator's monitoring capacity, one of his functions was to emphasize the need for accurate and timely recordkeeping, particularly in Greensboro, where recordkeeping and reporting functions (during the months of heaviest refugee influx) received less attention than meeting the urgent service needs of refugees.

The single area in which the two FASP projects sought the most extensive technical assistance (perhaps even more from the ORR Regional Director than from the State Coordinator) was in minimizing the impact on FASP refugees of the missionary activities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS or Mormon Church). LDS missionaries, in attempting to convert newly-arrived refugees to the Mormon faith, encouraged refugees to rely on LDS social services staff and on the church as the "guardians" of their well-being. Unfortunately, this message was in direct contradiction to the lesson being taught by the voluntary agencies: rely on yourself; be independent. The result was confused perceptions on the part of many FASP refugees, particularly in Charlotte, of the role of the sponsoring agency. These activities also, on several occasions, contributed to the migration of FASP refugees away from Charlotte. At the state level, policy officials within the lead state agency felt that the state should not intervene in what might be interpreted as a purely religious matter. Thus, it was ORR regional and national officials, more than the State Refugee Coordinator, who provided direct assistance in LDS-related negotiations.

## LOCAL ACTORS AND RESPONSIBILITIES

In both Charlotte and Greensboro, the principal actors involved in resettlement and services to FASP refugees included the following:

- the voluntary resettlement agencies, with responsibility for initial reception and placement of all FASP refugees, as well as for providing ongoing case management and services to them under contract with the state;
- other service providers, principally bilingual education and ESL instructors within the respective school systems, health screening clinics, and the agencies responsible for cash and medical assistance and for the Food Stamp program; and
- volunteers including both congregations and individuals.

The most central of these were the voluntary resettlement agencies, since they, as the sole RAP contractors within their respective cities, provided a broad range of social services to refugees in addition to initial reception and placement services.

The differences in the staffing patterns between Catholic Social Services in Charlotte and Lutheran Family Services in Greensboro reflect the differences in the history of the two agencies. Catholic Social

Services had a history of providing social services to refugees under state contract, and thus had a pre-existing staff with which to work, and into which to fit the FASP project. Lutheran Family Services, on the other hand, had only an Unaccompanied Minors contract within the state prior to 1983. The only services this agency had provided directly to other refugees in prior years were those that it could deliver using LIRS reception and placement funding and congregational support. Thus a staff needed to be hired "from the ground up" in order to implement the full range of case management and social services needed for FASP.

As a result, during the FASP demonstration, Catholic Social Services (CSS) in Charlotte had a staff of 15 individuals who were (at least in part) funded through their RAP social services contract with the state, while Lutheran Family Services (LFS) in Greensboro had only five state-funded staff persons. This staff included one CSS staff person, on loan to LFS, who served as the Health Specialist for the Greensboro FASP project. Finally, services in both agencies were augmented by the reception and placement (State Department-funded) services provided to FASP refugees.

In both Charlotte and Greensboro, relationships with mainstream service providers were supportive. Outside agencies such as the Department of Social Services, the school and community college systems, health departments, and local hospitals were helpful in providing services to FASP refugees. Appendix D contains a more detailed description of the local actors and their responsibilities in the two North Carolina FASP demonstration sites.

## SOCIAL SERVICES AVAILABLE TO AND UTILIZED BY REFUGEES

For the most part, the services available to FASP refugees in Charlotte and Greensboro were similar, and the service philosophies of the two resettlement agencies were consistent with each other. The two resettlement agencies, as the sole recipients of FASP social service funding, provided or arranged for the full set of social services covered within the state's RAP contract:

- orientation;
- transportation and interpreter services;
- health-related services;
- job development and placement;
- ESL instruction;
- home management services; and
- ongoing case management.

Orientation

Because these two agencies were responsible for both initial resettlement and ongoing social services, there was sometimes no clear line drawn between reception and placement and state-funded social services. Because of the volume of FASP arrivals, it would not have been possible to find individual or congregational sponsors for each FASP family. Thus, both agencies assumed sponsorship responsibliity while relying on individuals and congregations as volunteers. This practice was consistent with Catholic Social Services' ongoing practices for resettlement within the Charlotte metropolitan area, while for Lutheran Family Services it represented a departure from the LIRS tradition of congregational sponsorship.

Orientation services took several forms and were received by each arriving FASP family. First, families were informed about what to expect as they arrived and were being placed in temporary housing. Individual families were given information about the role and responsibilities of the sponsoring agency, what services they could expect to receive and what they should expect to learn to do for themselves, what to do in case of emergency, and what the sequence of events would be during the weeks after arrival. Other types of information, (including the importance of working and becoming independent, financial management, landlord-tenant relationships, and other basic information about life in the U.S.) were passed along in small group meetings or, in Greensboro, at community meetings attended by all FASP refugees. By the end of the FASP year, Greensboro staff had developed a more structured approach to orientation -- formal group sessions lasting several hours -- in order to make sure that arriving refugees all receive the information they need.

### Transportation and Interpreter Services

These services were used by each refugee family, and were usually linked to activities which involved interacting with persons other than sponsoring agency staff. For example, transportation and interpretation were provided when each refugee had a health screening appointment, an appointment for eligibility determination for Food Stamps or cash assistance, or a job interview. Transportation and interpretation are state-funded social services for North Carolina refugees, but transportation is also provided by volunteers, particularly for grocery shopping and trips to the refugee office.

### Health-Related Services

In addition to facilitating the initial health screening, the health specialists in both Charlotte and Greensboro were responsible for assuring that each refugee family received the ongoing health care needed. This was an overwhelming task at times, given the frequent need for health services among the 1983 Cambodian FASP refugees. It included learning to recognize early warning symptoms, responding to calls from alarmed parents at all hours of the night, making sure that medication was taken on schedule (and/or overcoming refugee's resistance to medication), gathering information for medical histories, making sure that pregnant women received prenatal care, etc.

### Job Development and Placement

Both CSS and LFS were required to certify that each adult refugee was registered for work and actually searching for a job, in order to comply with cash assistance and Food Stamps requirements. This is a procedural requirement that was distinct from the actual provision of employment services. In both Charlotte and Greensboro, the resettlement agencies used their own staff employment specialist, rather than relying on "mainstream" (e.g., Job Service) job developers. In both cities, job development and placement services were received by about 90% of the FASP refugees of working age — virtually all those who did not have insurmountable barriers to employment due to health conditions or the responsibility of caring for young children. At the time of the initial BPA field visit in September 1983, most heads of FASP household were working, but there remained a number of unemployed FASP adults. Some refugees had lost jobs previously held; more frequently, secondary wage earners in FASP households were just beginning to seek employment. By the time of the second BPA visit in March 1984, there was nearly full employment among adults in both sites. Employers calling the agencies hoping to hire refugee workers sometimes had to be turned away. The employment specialists were continuing to work with a few FASP refugees who were not yet sure they were able or ready to work. They were also helping some refugees to transfer into new jobs with better pay, better fringe benefits, or more opportunities for overtime work.

In Charlotte, the employment specialist most frequently developed jobs in companies that had previously hired other refugees and were known to provide at least the basic fringe benefits. In Greensboro, such a network of employers (known to the agency and accustomed to hiring refugees) did not exist and had to be developed during the FASP year.

## ESL Instruction

CSS in Charlotte provided ESL directly or arranged for it through referral to the community college, the YWCA, or their own structured volunteer program, as described in Appendix D. ESL was provided to all refugee children through the school systems. Adult ESL classes were not always well attended, though they were scheduled for evenings and even weekends. FASP refugees often worked evening shifts, and were thus more responsive to individually-arranged tutoring provided by volunteers. At the time of the second BPA site visit, 20 FASP refugees were involved in such a tutoring arrangement.

In Greensboro, the only provision for ESL was through the use of volunteers or through the mainstream education system. Due to resource constraints, ESL could not be provided as a direct service, though

English language instruction was available in the elementary and secondary schools, and in the local community college. However, the only formal ESL instruction available to adults during the FASP year (through the community college) was GED-oriented and emphasized reading and writing skills, rather than the survival-oriented spoken English that would have been most appropriate and useful to the FASP refugees. For several months during 1983, LFS arranged for a volunteer to teach ESL several times per week at the Welcome House. The practice of giving classes at this location increased access to ESL by newly-arrived refugees and made the Welcome House a focal point of the Cambodian community. Finally, after the end of the FASP year, LFS arranged with the community college for an alternative ESL program specifically designed to meet the needs of the Cambodian refugees, as described in Appendix D. Approximately 40 FASP refugees were enrolled in these ESL classes by March of 1984.

### Home Management Services

All FASP families have received extensive home management instruction, both formally and informally. Instruction has taken place in regularly-scheduled classes (Charlotte), in community meetings attended by all FASP refugees (Greensboro), and in one-to-one discussions. The content of these classes and discussions has included topics such as the following:

- the importance of keeping children clothed and diapered;
- how to get from place to place;
- how to use a vacuum cleaner, stove, refrigerator, garbage disposal, etc.;
- the importance of maintaining yards and keeping trash picked up;
- how to shop economically for food, and the importance of making Food Stamps last for the entire month;
- the importance of keeping appointments, such as for food stamp recertification, and of letting agency staff know about any official communication received from a government agency;

- how the welfare system works, and what happens to cash assistance once the household has earned income;
- how to change a lightbulb or unplug a stopped-up sink;
- how to set up a bank account and the advantages of using banks rather than keeping cash in the home; and
- other types of information related to household safety, emergency procedures, and numerous other "coping" skills which U.S. residents take for granted.

Ongoing Case Management

Case management in the North Carolina FASP projects consisted of a combination of tracking and fostering each refugee family's progress toward self-sufficiency and case management in the broader sense of keeping informed about (and responding to) each family's overall living situation and need for services. In Charlotte, designated case managers visited each refugee household at least once every week for this purpose, usually accompanied by a staff interpreter. Such visits were used, for example, to make sure that a refugee was taking medications on schedule, to find out if the landlord ever fixed the broken window, to check up on reports that a child was having a problem with neighboring children, or to find out why someone stopped attending ESL classes — in addition to responding to special requests for help with finances, food stamps, or a job-related problem. In Greensboro, because of the smaller staff size, such home visits did not occur quite so frequently. Instead, FASP refugees were encouraged (and reminded often) to ask for help when needed, with the result that by March 1984 the most successfully-resettled families were not often in contact with agency staff. Communication between service staff and refugees often took place without an interpreter, or by utilizing whatever bilingual skills were available in the household or the neighborhood. The staff interpreter's time was closely scheduled and usually involved interacting with an outside party, such as an employer or a doctor or a landlord, where language was more of a barrier than it was between staff and refugees.

In both North Carolina cities, ongoing case management consisted largely of responding to health care needs, mental health crises, and employment-related problems. Health care needs — ranging from routine or preventative care to minor illnesses to major surgery — were by far the most frequent and time consuming. Each project had at least one mental health episode which was serious enough to warrant inpatient care and the involvement of outside professionals. Staff in both cities wished that the "mainstream" mental health system were better-prepared to deal with the special needs of Cambodian refugees and/or more willing to understand the cultural differences which make effective intervention in mental health crises difficult. Other crises included such simple matters as clearing up a misunderstanding between an employer and a FASP refugee, unstopping a stopped drain, or getting the heat turned on for the winter. In addition, case management included activities such as responding to (or attempting to prevent) LDS intervention in the resettlement process, explaining to families the reasons why they should think twice about moving to another city or state, etc.

## FASP RESETTLEMENT VERSUS "RESETTLEMENT AS USUAL"

Although the resettlement and service practices observed in the North Carolina FASP sites were not dramatically different from resettlement and service practices in many parts of the U.S., a number of factors made the FASP experience unique for the staffs of the two sponsoring agencies:

- The Cambodian FASP refugees had more difficult adjustments to make in order to be successfully resettled than had any previous group of refugees arriving in these sites. Even though CSS in Charlotte had previously resettled a smaller group of Cambodians, this earlier group had far more education, English language skills, and experience living in an urban environment than the FASP group had. The CSS Administrator believes, in retrospect, that key CSS staff persons were unprepared to cope with the urgent needs of the FASP Cambodian population.

- The experience of resettling a large group of ethnically-similar refugees, and the need to foster a sense of community among them, led to a large number of organized activities that were unique to FASP. Examples were the development of a Buddhist temple in Charlotte, frequent "community meetings" in Greensboro, and efforts in both cities to assist with special events and group celebrations. Such efforts have exceeded the involvement in "ethnic community building" that is normally a part of refugee resettlement activities and were unprecedented in the experience of these two agencies.
- The MIS-related reporting requirements under FASP were a new burden for resettlement agency staff. This burden did not pay off during the FASP year by providing them with any information that was useful to them, and often created conflicting demands on their time, in combination with the provision of direct services.
- The experience of being part of a nationwide demonstration added to the usual urgency felt by agency staff to produce positive outcomes. The need to minimize both refugee dependency on cash assistance and secondary out-migration led to a strong focus on employment services and on documenting the effectiveness of those services.
- The need to plan for the post-FASP year has led to efforts on the part of both agencies to seek innovative funding strategies. In order to maintain the level of service that was developed during the FASP year, (particularly in Greensboro, where this service level represented an expansion of agency activities) both CSS and LFS have looked for sources of continuation funding. LFS has written proposals for grant funding for a new Cambodian MAA, as well as for foundation funding for a cultural center. CSS is tentatively exploring ideas for new demonstration projects. Both agencies are facing a

continuing urgent need for services (both for the FASP refugees themselves and for the newly-arriving families who are joining their FASP relatives) combined with declining ORR social services funding at the state level. Thus, they have an unusually strong incentive to develop their grant-writing capabilities.

## How FASP Implementation Altered Resettlement Agency Delivery of Reception and Placement Services

In both Charlotte and Greensboro, the large volume of FASP arrivals during the first six months of 1983 strained resettlement agency capabilities. As a consequence, staff often did not have time to "get to know" each arriving refugee as quickly or as completely as they would have liked. In Greensboro, even though Lutheran Family Services had shifted somewhat during 1982 toward more agency involvement in providing services than is usual for an LIRS affiliate (given the agency's policy of utilizing congregational sponsorships), 1983 was the first year of full agency sponsorship. The sheer number and timing of FASP arrivals and the intensity of their needs meant that the agency had to depend almost exclusively on its own staff to provide services, while continuing to rely on congregations throughout the area for valued voluntary support. Volunteers were hardest to find during the summer of 1983, which was the time of the heaviest concentration of arrivals and the most intense need.

## How FASP Implementation Altered Refugee Social Service Delivery

The major differences between FASP social services and ongoing social service delivery at the local level in North Carolina were relatively minor. They consisted principally of more intensive and more individualized case management than had been possible prior to FASP, and perhaps even more intensive and more focused (on early employment and self-sufficiency) efforts to deliver social services. The differences were primarily attributable to the characteristics of the Cambodian FASP refugees. In general, North Carolina's Cambodian FASP refugees presented a great challenge to resettlement and service workers for a number of perceived reasons:

- a high rate of illiteracy among the Cambodian FASP group;
- a level of English language facility that was lower than any encountered among previous refugee groups;
- frequent need for health services, caused in part by camp conditions, malnutrition and years of inactivity;
- mental health problems, usually traceable to the horror, loss of family members, and sometimes torture undergone during the pre-camp period;
- a tendency to depend on others, formed out of the habits acquired during camp and prior to camp, when submissive behavior patterns were formed,
- a lack of transferrable or marketable work skills among the largely-rural FASP Cambodian population; and
- expectations (based on pre-arrival second-hand information) that life in the U.S. would be easy or that "the sponsor" would do everything for them.

These differences meant primarily that a great deal more individual staff time was spent working with each refugee than had been required in prior years. Because of the tremendous variation in the degrees of their exposure to urban life and their ability to understand American life and expectations, different refugee families often had unique needs that agency staff had to respond to on an individual basis. Group discussions were frequent, though, as were workshops on topics such as budgeting and housecleaning. North Carolina's Cambodian FASP refugees, perhaps more than most groups, have also needed to learn to trust persons in positions of authority. Establishing and maintaining that trust, while encouraging refugees to learn and change and become more "American" and more independent, required a great deal of time and skill.

In both Charlotte and Grensboro the task of serving FASP refugees was interrupted and complicated, as no previous resettlement effort had ever been, by the extremely time-consuming efforts on the part of Catholic Social Services and Lutheran Family Services staff to counteract the influence on FASP refugees of LDS missionaries' proselytizing activities. This effort diffused agency staff energy and kept them from concentrating fully on more constructive activities. This problem is discussed in more detail below in the section which covers migration outcomes.

## How FASP Implementation Altered State Refugee Program Administration

One of the most important departures of FASP from ongoing refugee resettlement efforts is in the extent to which coordination and cooperation among state, federal, and local actors was achieved. The involvement of state (and local) officials in the FASP planning process -- and the very existence of that process -- contributed to an improvement in the communication and information flow for everyone involved. At all levels, the feeling of being centrally involved in resettlement activities and decisions facilitated the joint efforts of public and private actors and led to smooth implementation of FASP.

The most direct effect of FASP on state administrative activities was seen in the effort to design and implement the statewide FASP management information system (MIS) in North Carolina. This effort was time-consuming and frustrating and in the end was generally not perceived as having been worth the effort. North Carolina's Department of Human Resources, Division of Social Services, has an existing automated Services Information System (SIS) which documents each unit of service delivered to each recipient of social services in the state, and which produces aggregate reports by service provider and by type of service. The FASP MIS was considered by the state as an adjunct to (or subprogram of) the SIS information system, even though it required an entirely separate input document and contained substantially different information than does the SIS. At the time of the initial BPA field visit, several start-up steps had been accomplished:

(1) The FASP MIS input forms had been designed;

(2) Charlotte's CSS Refugee Office staff had filled out the forms for each FASP case;

(3) The input form had undergone a revision deleting information about camps of residence and about receipt of cash assistance (since cash assistance information

was available in a separate system) and precoding the form for direct keypunching;

(4) Charlotte's CSS Refugee Office had filled out the revised input forms for each FASP case, thus partially duplicating their prior reporting effort;

(5) LFS staff in Greensboro had partially completed the process of filling out the revised input forms; and

(6) The initial programming effort -- needed so that the existing information system would accept the new information — had begun.

By the end of the FASP demonstration year, however, no significant progress had been made toward full FASP MIS implementation. The response of the state Department of Human Resources was not as timely as the State Refugee Coordinator would have wished; keypunching of input forms had not been completed. In addition, no program had yet been written to analyze the information. The State Refugee Coordinator had received no direct requests from local or federal officials specifying the types of analysis desired, and state programmers had not had the time needed for the project.

By the time of the second BPA visit, several further steps in MIS implementation had been completed:

- a supplement to the initial instrument had been designed, in order to gather information about refugees' use of food stamps;
- the food stamp supplement had been completed by both agencies and submitted to the state;
- keypunching of all input forms had been completed;
- a "dump" of all the raw data had been printed out; and
- the State Coordinator had submitted to the programmers a list of analyses to be performed and had specified the format for the report to be produced.

The analyses were finally produced about three months after the end of the FASP year. They consisted of simple frequencies on a number of data items:

- whether or not the refugee received orientation information while overseas;
- the DOS-ACVA code assigned to each case;
- educational attainment, for employable adults;
- number of weeks of ESL and vocational ESL instruction attended while in the camps/processing centers;
- level of English proficiency attained prior to arrival in the U.S.;
- types of jobs held prior to 1975, between 1975 and the date of exit from Cambodia, and while in the refugee camps;
- relationship of closest relative in the U.S.; and
- state of residence of the closest relative in the U.S.

In addition, the MIS listed for each refugee the date of entry, dates and amounts of Food Stamp receipt, the dates of health screening, types of health problems, and employment information (dates of placement, types of jobs, wages, termination dates, and reasons for termination) and information on any out-migration that occurred.

Given sufficient time and resources, the system could have produced some analyses which would have been useful for the purpose of evaluating different resettlement approaches. Examples of such potential data summaries and analyses are:

- average (mean) number of weeks between arrival date and initial job;
- average number of weeks refugee families were dependent on Food Stamps;
- crosstabulations of length of time unemployed (and/or starting wage) by characteristics such as:
  - educational attainment;
  - type of previous training and/or work experience;
  - ESL level at arrival;

  - family size; and
  - amount of orientation received in camps;
- crosstabulations of the same sets of characteristics by migration outcomes; and
- crosstabulations of employment outcomes (including wages) by migration outcomes.

Several MIS implementation barriers accounted for the fact that analyses such as these were never performed. One such barrier was the fact that startup was slow, and that a great deal of time was required for forms design and completion, combined with the one-year limitation on the length of the demonstration year. Realistically, it would have taken more than one year to design and implement a new MIS from the ground up, given the other constraints found within this particular system. Other barriers were related to the design of the system itself:

- The FASP MIS was designed as an adjunct to the state agencies' services information system (SIS), thus relying on the agency's mainframe computer, rather than as a freestanding microcomputer-based system, which would have allowed for more flexibility and faster turnaround[5];
- The FASP MIS had to compete with the agency's other information and reporting needs, since the MIS was built into North Carolina DHR's computer system;
- The FASP MIS was not fully integrated into the SIS, so that a number of potentially interesting crosstabulations (such as types of services received by outcomes) were not feasible.
- The income maintenance MIS is a completely separate system, so that cash assistance dependency information could not be analyzed together with information on individual and family characteristics.

The other severe problem with North Carolina's FASP MIS relates to missing data. It was not possible to ascertain whether the considerable data gaps were caused by incomplete reporting or by faulty data entry. Furthermore, efforts to update the information ceased (by financial necessity) a short time after the end of the demonstration year.

Compared to the information available from agency files and from interviews with agency staff, the information in the MIS (particularly the information related to employment and wages) is perceived to be so incomplete as to be misleading.

The State Coordinator also observed that local case managers probably already had "in their heads" more information about FASP refugee characteristics and outcomes than the MIS would have been able to produce. Therefore, the usefulness of the MIS was perceived at the outset to be limited to providing information to state and federal evaluators, rather than helping the local agencies themselves.

In summary, MIS implementation was a frustrating process which continued past the end of the program year and for which the $25,000 ORR allocation was not sufficient. Frustration was felt both at the state and local levels, while the cost difficulties were felt principally at the state level. About 60% of the $25,000 allocation was used to reimburse the resettlement agencies for the additional staff time needed to complete and update the FASP MIS documents. Programming and processing the information have turned out to be more costly than originally anticipated. However, most of the problems encountered in North Carolina may be attributed to the difficulty of starting up a new system. The feasibility of implementing an MIS for subsequent FASP projects will depend upon the level of cooperation of state-level systems staff and the level of sophistication and adaptibility of existing state systems.

## CHARACTERISTICS AND EXPERIENCES OF THE FASP REFUGEES

The total number of FASP arrivals in North Carolina, both planned and actual, is summarized in Table 9. Both North Carolina agencies resettled a larger number of individuals than had initially been planned, though Lutheran Family Services in Greensboro exceeded its FASP commitment by more individuals than did Catholic Social Services in Charlotte.

### Description of Data Sources

The data for this report were taken from several sources:

- the handwritten FASP MIS input documents, as they were

Table 9

### Total Number of North Carolina FASP Refugees

| | Total Cases | Total Individuals |
|---|---|---|
| Planned Arrival Levels: | | |
| Charlotte | -- | 300 |
| Greensboro | -- | 200 |
| Actual Arrival Levels | | |
| Charlotte | 69 | 305 |
| Greensboro | 42 | 220 |
| Total North Carolina Arrivals | 111 | 525 |

submitted by CSS in Charlotte and LFS in Greensboro to the State Refugee Coordinator. Both agencies made available copies of the full set of those documents to the BPA research team;

- the income maintenance information system from the North Carolina Department of Human Resources;
- the FASP MIS analysis completed in March, 1984;
- agency case records and employment lists;
- interviews with resettlement agency staff; and
- interviews with FASP refugees and American friends.

The data on some refugee characteristics were tabulated and analyzed manually for a random sample of 22 FASP cases for each site, as well as for the initial 18 families who moved away from Charlotte. Sample cases were chosen in such a way that refugees entering throughout the arrival period were represented. Cases were listed by order of arrival, and every third case (Charlotte) or every other case (Greensboro) was included in the sample.

## Characteristics of FASP Arrivals

By comparison to Arizona, there were very few FASP cases in North Carolina that consisted of a single person. Charlotte seemed to have received more widows with children than did Greensboro. There were about the same number of employable adults per case in Greensboro as in Charlotte, and the characteristics of individual adult refugees appeared comparable.

Table 10 summarizes the characteristics of 44 randomly-selected FASP cases (22 in Charlotte and 22 in Greensboro). About 22% of the sample families consisted of three or four persons, while nearly twice as many had five or six persons. The remaining one-third of these families were either smaller than three or larger than six persons. Over one-half of these families were intact families with children, while the next largest group consisted of families with children but with one parent missing. The Greensboro sample consisted of a higher proportion of large families with both parents present than was found in

## Table 10

## Characteristics of a Sample of FASP Cases

## North Carolina

| Characteristic | Charlotte | Greensboro |
|---|---|---|
| **Family Size** | | |
| 1 person | 3 | 1 |
| 2 persons | 2 | 1 |
| 3 persons | 3 | 1 |
| 4 persons | 4 | 2 |
| 5 persons | 3 | 8 |
| 6 persons | 5 | 3 |
| 7 or more persons | 2 | 5 |
| Total | 22 | 22 |
| **Family Composition** | | |
| Single Person | 4 | 1 |
| Childless Couple | 2 | 2 |
| Intact Family | 7 | 19 |
| Missing Parent | 6 | 0 |
| Family Fragments | 3 | 0 |
| Total | 22 | 22 |

the Charlotte sample. There also appeared to be a large number of very young babies and expectant mothers among the groups in both cities.

Table 11 shows the characteristics of all "employable" adults in the sample. Not all of these were in fact employable because of poor health, advanced age, or child care responsibilities, but they were all entered as employable adults in the data system.[6] Only 4% of these persons had ten or more years education in Cambodia, while over 40% had three or fewer years education, and many of those had none at all. Nine of the 92 persons appeared not to have had any ESL instruction even in the camps, while another 17 were assessed at the lowest level. The remainder were spread about evenly among increasing ESL levels. Data on overseas ESL enrollment were incomplete, with over half of the 92 sample persons unaccounted for or assumed not to have been enrolled. Most of those for whom data were reported were enrolled for between 11 and 20 weeks.

For comparison with the sample data above, data on all North Carolina FASP refugees from the FASP MIS are presented in Table 12 (number of years of education in Cambodia), Table 13 (ESL and VESL in camps), and Table 14 (English proficiency at arrival).[7] These figures show patterns similar to those presented and discussed above for the sample cases included in this study. The large amount of missing data made this an unsatisfactory data source.[8]

## History Prior to Leaving Cambodia

North Carolina's FASP refugees had little experience in Cambodia that would have prepared them for their life in this country. The vast majority had never worked for wages, but only in their own homes or on a farm. Table 15 summarizes the prior work experience of the North Carolina FASP group, to the extent that it was documented on the MIS. Those data, though fragmented, show that there were few marketable skills among the refugees in this group. Over one-fourth of the sample adults had been farmers prior to their arrival at the refugee camps, with another 10% having been housewives. After 1975, nearly one-fourth were entered in the military. While in the camps half of these persons had no job. A small but significant number, though, acquired their

## Table 11

## Characteristics of a Sample of FASP Adults
## North Carolina

| | Charlotte | Greensboro |
|---|---|---|
| **Years of Education** | | |
| None: | 17 | 5 |
| 1-3: | 11 | 7 |
| 4-6: | 10 | 7 |
| 7-9: | 5 | 0 |
| 10 or more | 3 | 1 |
| Unknown | 3 | 26 |
| Total | 46 | 46 |
| **ESL Level at Arrival** | | |
| None: | 8 | 1 |
| Level A: | 12 | 5 |
| Level B: | 8 | 7 |
| Level C: | 7 | 7 |
| Level D | 8 | 3 |
| Unknown: | 3 | 23 |
| Total | 46 | 46 |
| **ESL Weeks in Camp** | | |
| None or unknown: | 22 | 26 |
| 1-10: | 3 | -- |
| 11-20: | 19 | 20 |
| 21 or more: | 2 | -- |
| Total | 46 | 46 |

EST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 12

## Number of Years of Education in Cambodia

## All North Carolina Adult FASP Refugees

| | Charlotte | | Greensboro | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Years | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| None | 42 | 32% | 10 | 13% |
| 1 - 5 | 57 | 44% | 20 | 26% |
| 6 - 10 | 20 | 15% | 8 | 10% |
| 11- 15 | 6 | 5% | 0 | -- |
| 16 or more | 0 | -- | 0 | -- |
| Unknown | 5 | 4% | 39 | 51% |
| Total | 130 | 100% | 77 | 100% |

Source: FASP MIS

### Table 13

### ESL and VESL* Received in Camps

### All North Carolina Adult FASP Refugees

| | Charlotte | | Greensboro | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Number of Weeks of ESL | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| 0 - 10 | 13 | 10% | 2 | 3% |
| 11 - 15 | 33 | 25% | 20 | 26% |
| 16 - 20 | 30 | 23% | 17 | 22% |
| 21 or more | 1 | 1% | 1 | 1% |
| Unknown | 53 | 41% | 37 | 48% |
| Total | 130 | 100% | 77 | 100% |
| Number of Weeks of VESL* | | | | |
| 0 - 10 | 16 | 12% | 20 | 26% |
| 11 - 15 | 5 | 4% | 1 | 1% |
| 16 - 20 | 6 | 5% | 1 | 1% |
| 21 or more | 1 | 1% | 3 | 4% |
| Unknown | 102 | 78% | 52 | 68% |
| Total | 130 | 100% | 77 | 100% |

*Vocational English as a Second Language

Source: FASP MIS

EST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 14

## Level of English Proficiency at Arrival

## All North Carolina Adult FASP Refugees

| Level | Charolotte | | Greensboro | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | Percent | Number | Percent |
| A | 48 | 37% | 11 | 14% |
| B | 18 | 14% | 15 | 20% |
| C | 23 | 18% | 11 | 14% |
| D | 7 | 5% | 4 | 5% |
| E | 6 | 5% | 0 | -- |
| Unknown | 18 | 21% | 36 | 47% |
| Total | 130 | 100% | 77 | 100% |

Source: FASP MIS

### Table 15

### Previous Job History

### All North Carolina Adult FASP Refugees

| | Charlotte | | | Greensboro | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Pre-1975 | 1975-Exit | Camps | Pre-1975 | 1975 Exit | Camps |
| Farmer | 43 | 40 | 2 | 8 | 27 | 0 |
| Student | 32 | 19 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Military | 4 | 29 | 0 | 15 | 3 | 0 |
| Vehicle Mechanic | 0 | 1 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 8 |
| Driver (Taxi, Bus) | 3 | 1 | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Carpenter/Builder | 1 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Textile Worker | 2 | 0 | 5 | 1 | 0 | 2 |
| Homemaker | 6 | 18 | 4 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Office Worker | 0 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| Administrator | 1 | 2 | 0 | 1 | 0 | 0 |
| Stevedore | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Small Business Owner | 1 | 2 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Electrician | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Teacher | 1 | 0 | 5 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Held No Job | 1 | 4 | 84 | 2 | 0 | 5 |
| Other | 5 | 5 | 3 | 2 | 2 | 6 |
| Unknown | 30 | 9 | 11 | 45 | 44 | 51 |
| Total | 130 | 130 | 130 | 77 | 77 | 77 |

Source: FASP MIS

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

first training or experience in a skilled occupation while they were in the camps.

Perhaps of more importance in explaining some of the problems that have been encountered in resettlement were the experiences that led these persons to escape from Cambodia at considerable risk to themselves and their families. Loss of family members - spouses, parents, sibling, and children - was universal, and often occurred under traumatic circumstances. Many Cambodian FASP refugees do not know whether or not close relatives are alive.[9] Starvation and enforced work were the rule, both for children and adults. Torture was frequent, especially when it was discovered or suspected that one had been a soldier. Fear was universal. As a result of both their pre-camp experiences and the amount of time spent in camps, North Carolina's FASP refugees were fearful, reluctant to trust anyone in authority (or anyone outside their own family), often malnourished and in poor health, and in a few cases severely emotionally disturbed.

## Refugee Camps and Overseas Orientation Experiences

The Cambodian FASP refugees spent, on average, more than three years in refugee camps and processing centers. Conditions there varied from situations in which one had to struggle to get enough food and water to survive (it is said that one reason many children lied about their age was to increase their food ration) to "merely" primitive.

As was true for Arizona's FASP refugees, pre-arrival orientation appears not to have been very meaningful to the North Carolina FASP refugees. Many of them, once reminded that there had been slides, remembered that they had seen them. A smaller number remembered the written information that was circulated. One refugee in Charlotte, however, proudly produced the Khmer document that provided information about North Carolina, having kept it for several months. A re-translation of that document into English showed that it had been faithfully translated, and that the refugees had received factual information about Charlotte and Greensboro, except that the number of pre-existing Cambodian refugees had been somewhat exaggerated. However, many FASP refugees were not able to read this document, and many others appeared not to have noticed it in the flurry of forms and papers that preceded departure.

The prevailing notions about North Carolina in the camps seem to be that it is sometimes cold there and that there are plenty of jobs to be had. More active rumors seem to have circulated about California (perhaps as much in North Carolina as in the camps). Refugees seemed curious about California, but usually nodded agreement with comments that California is crime-ridden, crowded, and expensive.

Refugee and former refugees also reported that rumors in the camps about resettlement experiences in the U.S. are widespread and frequently misleading. Previous groups of refugees had written to friends and relatives in the camps, exaggerating the favorable qualities of life in the U.S. Sometimes these reports were accompanied by snapshots of families standing next to automobiles or nice houses, even when an automobile or house had to be "borrowed" for the purpose of taking the snapshot. It was sometimes said that refugees in the U.S. are the guests of the government for the first 18 months, that one doesn't have to work, but can go to school and learn English. Rumors that the sponsor will pay for a house, or will supply refugees with food and clothing, sometimes overstate what a sponsoring agency can do. Though these rumors were counteracted by the more official message that is given through cultural orientation classes, the question remains: whom did the refugees believe? In fact, several of North Carolina's FASP refugees arrived in this country with misconceptions about what could or would be done for them by their sponsor. This has led to misunderstandings between the refugees and resettlement agency staff. The FASP Coordinator in Greensboro reported that, despite their small staff, LFS intended to conduct an extended orientation session with each arriving refugee family, making sure that they understood the areas of sponsor responsibility and the things that they must do for themselves.

## Experiences after Arrival in North Carolina

Perhaps the most general impression of refugee experience soon after arrival in North Carolina has to do with their being overwhelmed by their interaction with various government officials (such as in the

Social Security office, the Food Stamp office, and the welfare office). Many of their initial experiences involved filling out forms, standing in line, and dealing with public officials. They seemed to appreciate the help of their sponsoring agency in getting through this maze, and to value the companionship of their new Cambodian friends and neighbors. Few of the refugees interviewed during the initial BPA site visit had ever been to an American home, with the exception of the homes of agency staff and some especially active volunteer families in Greensboro. In particular, refugee children appeared to be overwhelmed by the experience of the first few weeks in school and to have stayed pretty much to themselves. Younger children playing outside their homes during the day tended to stay within about ten feet of the front door.

Almost all FASP refugees have lived in two different apartments since their arrival. They were initially moved into temporary quarters, whether grouped into the large Welcome House in Greensboro with other newly-arrived families, or quartered in the temporary apartments (dubbed "the hotel" by CSS staff) in Charlotte. Permanent apartments were then located, though this process took as long as several weeks in Greensboro when housing conditions were tight. Most refugees have remained in this second residence, as finding new housing was difficult and would have involved breaking leases.

Many of the employed refugees had to commute some distance to work (as far as fifteen or twenty miles) since some of the clusters of industry are in neighboring cities.[10] There was some discussion of relocating some of the Greensboro refugees in order to be nearer to their work, but the idea was dismissed quickly. Moving would have meant difficulty getting to ESL classes and being too far away from agency staff in case of emergency. In addition, only the designated "magnet" schools in Greensboro have a special ESL program for children outside the regular classroom, which also allows them to continue with "mainstream" classes. Toward the end of the demonstration year, the commute to work became less of an issue, since many refugees had acquired cars. The remainder worked out convenient carpooling arrangements, either with other refugees or with American co-workers. Several employers have been helpful about providing daily transportation to their FASP workers.

It is difficult to summarize the overall experiences of North Carolina's FASP refugees, as they have varied on a case-by-case basis, depending upon the background of each family and on a number of circumstances in which they have found themselves since their arrival. The following observations are thus not universally applicable, but emerge from interviews with resettlement agency staff and from refugees themselves.

North Carolina's FASP refugees have struggled to survive economically. For the majority, this has meant adapting to a very foreign work environment, using machines to make or process products which they had never seen prior to arrival in the U.S. It has meant learning how to be on time every day. After many years of inactivity and waiting in the camps, time had little significance. It has required learning to take initiative, when self-initiated action was useless in the camps and punished severely before that. For some, it has meant learning to cope with a bewildering public transportation system, or learning to fix a broken-down bicycle, or trying to learn to drive a car. It has often meant learning lessons from the unfortunate experiences of others — such as the man who was fired because he didn't know how to turn on the bathroom light and therefore left the door open, or the man who wrecked his moped while intoxicated, or the man who refused one job offer and then struggled for many weeks only to be forced by economic necessity to accept a job that was less desirable than the one he had originally turned down.

For some FASP refugees (particularly those in Charlotte who now have friends in California), economic survival has meant making the most of the welfare system. Some of these refugees have seen how unforgiving the welfare system can be when their benefits have been cut off after they missed an appointment for eligibility recertification, or when they had to pay back a benefit check received after they were employed. One man who had been here for many months steadfastly refused to understand why his food stamp benefits were cut by $30 when he received a $60 increase in earnings from his job. Most North Carolina FASP refugees have had to learn to ration their Food Stamps so that they don't go hungry at the end of the month.

An unusually large number of North Carolina's FASP refugees have experienced considerable health care needs, which has meant interacting with perhaps the most bewildering system of all -- hospitals and health clinics -- where language and cultural barriers cannot be overcome easily. One young girl, on her way to North Carolina from overseas, was rushed from the Atlanta airport to the hospital for an appendectomy, before knowing where her new home was to be. Several have faced childbirth under unfamiliar and frightening circumstances. Others have worried about sick children, especially in the middle of the night with no easy access to a telephone, and little knowledge of what to do if they did have a telephone.[11] However, American neighbors and friends have often proved helpful at such times.

Ongoing needs for health care combined with the difficulty of finding jobs with fully-paid health insurance coverage have sometimes acted as a barrier to employment. The most striking instance of this problem was a family in which the wife had been treated for cancer. Her husband had also needed surgery after arrival, but by March of 1984 he was healthy and anxious to begin working. He did begin his job search, but was concerned about the possibility that his wife might need further extended medical care for which he would have no way of paying without Medicaid.

Some interactions with the health care system have been more positive, though nonetheless frightening. The mother and a five-year old son in a family of eight, each blind in one eye, recently underwent eye surgery to prepare them to receive glass eyes. As they were taken away to the hospital, the husband (father) was furious, convinced that they would never return home. When they arrived home two days later, both the mother and her son were surprised that the procedure had not been painful and had left them ready to resume their active lives. The husband was relieved, though exhausted after two days of both working and caring for the five remaining children. Other medical "miracles" such as the lens implant which has restored the sight of a blind older woman, are slowly increasing the FASP refugees' level of confidence in the health care system.

Finally, North Carolina's FASP refugees have begun to feel at home in their new surroundings. They have learned to operate — though they still marvel at — basic household appliances. They have, for the most part, learned to maintain their households sufficiently well to meet American standards of acceptability. They have been taught to knock on the door before entering someone else's home, to greet Americans with a handshake, and to say "no" when necessary. They have developed friendships with some Americans. In Greensboro, LFS staff and American volunteers and neighbors have been their strongest supports. In Charlotte, and more recently in Greensboro as well, those American friends have sometimes been members of the Mormon Church. And for the most part, FASP refugees have learned through experience to trust their sponsors (resettlement agency staff) to act in their long-run interest, even though they have not always immediately understood the reasons for some of the decisions staff have made.

## Refugee Satisfaction and Intention to Stay in North Carolina

Overall, the FASP refugees in North Carolina show signs of being remarkably well-adjusted and happy in their new homes. They greet their "sponsors" with smiles and hugs; they prepare Cambodian food for their American friends; they join enthusiastically in planning for special celebrations such as Cambodian New Year. As they begin earning and saving larger amounts of money, they take increasing pride in their surroundings, their cars, and their jobs.

When interviewed in March of 1984, many FASP refugees discussed their principal goals: saving money, buying a car, improving their housing, and being able to help their relatives who will soon arrive from overseas. They saw North Carolina as a favorable location in which to work toward these goals. There were still a few FASP refugees who simply did not want to work for a living, or who were not psychologically ready to work. Such tendencies were perhaps encouraged by the rumors in the camps and by communications from friends in California about "the easy life." Staff in Charlotte were convinced by March 1984 that those refugees who were most susceptible to the lure of welfare benefits had already moved away. The group that remained in

Charlotte appeared to be stable, setting long-range goals for themselves, and advancing steadily. Though it was difficult to predict whether refugees in either city would remain permanently, the Cambodian communities appeared to be assimilating into the overall community.

## FASP OUTCOMES

### Employment Outcomes

In North Carolina, employment outcomes may have been achieved somewhat less rapidly than they have been in Arizona, but they have been achieved consistently, in spite of multiple barriers to employment. In Greensboro, all but about ten refugee families had at least one adult employed by September 1983. The exceptions were families in which health care needs or advanced age precluded employment, families who had been in the U.S. for less than six weeks, and one case in which the head of household had tried two jobs and had been unable to perform adequately in either of them.

The sources of employment information on FASP refugees in North Carolina were:

- the input documents for the FASP management information system which were received from both CSS in Charlotte and LFS in Greensboro and which represented case status as of September 1983;
- case files from the resettlement agencies; and
- detailed lists of employers, starting dates and wages maintained by the employment specialists at both agencies.

More detailed anecdotal information about the employment of selected refugees was gained through interviews with agency staff and refugees in both cities.

For the 44 randomly selected cases (22 in Charlotte and 22 in Greensboro), Table 16 shows the length of time between arrival and employment for the 32 adult Charlotte FASP refugees and the 34 adult FASP refugees from Greensboro who were employed or had been prior to March 1984. These 66 individuals with some employment experience since

## Table 16

## Length of Time Between Arrival and First Job for Sample FASP Refugees

## North Carolina

| Time Between Arrival and Hire | Charlotte | Greensboro |
|---|---|---|
| 1 - 6 weeks | 13 | 6 |
| 7 - 12 weeks | 7 | 10 |
| 13-18 weeks | 3 | 6 |
| 19 - 24 weeks | 5 | 6 |
| 25 or more weeks | 4 | 6 |
| Total | 32 | 34 |

arrival represent 74% of the 89 employable adults in the random sample. However, the number of employable adults is exaggerated since it includes persons with insurmountable obstacles to employment and those with significant child care responsibilities.

All of the 22 sample cases in Charlotte, with the exception of one woman who moved away soon after arrival, have had at least one family member employed since arrival. Two men were advised to delay obtaining employment because they had pregnant wives and needed to wait until after their children were born in order to retain Medicaid eligibility. Five households had two working adults, one household had three, and a third had four employed family members.

Of the 23 adult refugee individuals in the sample who have remained in Charlotte and have held jobs, nine have experienced turnover at some point. One left for health reasons, three have been laid off, three have left for better jobs, and two were fired because they couldn't meet production expectations. All but one of the persons who were laid off or fired have since found new jobs. In addition, seven persons quit jobs in order to move away.

In Greensboro, all of the 22 sample families had at least one employed adult by March of 1984, with the exception of one woman who moved away. Four heads of household are currently holding two jobs, and one family has three employed adults. Secondary wage earners were slower to find employment in Greensboro than in Charlotte; the employment specialist's emphasis was first on getting one person per household employed, on upgrading those jobs to an acceptable level, and on finding replacement jobs for those few individuals who had lost their jobs (four of the sample, both re-employed within a few weeks). Of the 47 adults in the sample, 34 were working, one had moved away, ten were not looking for work (one because of age, the other nine because of child care responsibilities - there are seven families with very young babies) and three had said that they might be interested in working. Each of the three had, however, turned down a job that was offered or had declined to go on at least one interview. During one week in March 1984, the employment specialist reluctantly turned down twelve employers who were seeking Cambodian workers.

The starting wages of FASP refugees are shown in Table 17. Nearly half (47%) began at or near minimum wage, while about one-sixth had hourly wages of $3.75 or more. However, this information does not represent refugees' actual total earnings, even initially. Many of the minimum wage and $3.50 per hour jobs had a provision for production-based pay, which allowed refugees very quickly to be earning more than $4.00 per hour. In addition, many jobs included opportunities for overtime work. March 1984 wages of FASP refugees were summarized in Table 18. Over three fourths of these workers were earning more than $3.75 per hour, with nearly two-thirds earning more than $4.00. An examination of the difference between these and the wages at which the refugee started reflects the progress that they made in adjusting to their work situations, as well as an overall improvement in economic conditions.

In both Charlotte and Greensboro, employers have been so pleased with their Cambodian workers that they have often requested additional Cambodian employees. Both resettlement agencies by March 1984, were running out of people to refer. One employer was extremely upset when his Cambodian worker gave notice - the worker had found another job with more advancement potential. The employer immediately offered the worker a $.25 raise, invited the entire family to his home for dinner, and took the refugee worker on a fishing trip. The worker decided not to accept the new job, and so another FASP refugee took it instead. Another employer asked the Greensboro employment specialist for a referral of two teenagers to do some odd jobs one weekend. They were so productive that the employer has been consistently "finding" odd jobs for them to do after school and weekends ever since, and has promised them summer jobs at $4.00 per hour.

There is not a great deal of variation among the jobs held in Charlotte. As of March 1984, two-thirds of all employed FASP refugees were textile workers; four did maintenance work, two worked in restaurants, and others had found jobs as teacher aide, glass installer, carpenter, bakery worker, steel industry worker, and electronics industry worker. In Greensboro, the most frequent jobs were found in the furniture manufacturing industry. These jobs included upholstery work as well as

## Table 17

## Starting Wages of Sample FASP Refugees*

## North Carolina

| Wage | Charlotte | Greensboro |
|---|---|---|
| \$3.35 - \$3.49 | 12 | 19 ** |
| \$3.50 - \$3.74 | 14 | 9 |
| \$3.75 and over | 6 | 6 |
| Total | 32 | 34 |

*Many of these persons have had wage increases since they began work; others earn substantially more than minimum wage through overtime or production-based pay.

**Of these persons, two are holding two jobs.

## Table 18

## Wages of FASP Refugees

## March 1984

| Wage Level | Charlotte[a] | Greensboro[b] |
|---|---|---|
| $3.35 - $3.49 | 2 | 4 |
| $3.50 - $3.74 | 14 | 7 |
| $3.75 - $3.99 | 5 | 13 |
| $4.00 - $4.24 | 8 | 20 |
| $4.25 - $4.49 | 3 | 6 |
| $4.50 - $4.74 | 9 | 3 |
| $4.75 - $.99 | 9 | 0 |
| $5.00 and Over | 16 | 2 |
| Total Number Working | 66 | 53 |
| Average Wage | $4.69 | $4.13 |

[a] Charlotte FASP refugees' wages are calculated based on actual earnings, including earnings for overtime work, divided by the number of hours worked (averaged over a period of four to six months) so that they represent an accurate estimate of actual refugee earnings.

[b] Greensboro figures do not include several "supplementary" jobs which refugees hold in the evening in addition to their primary jobs. In addition, the majority of Greensboro's FASP refugees earn substantially more than the hourly wage indicates, since they are frequently offered

assembly and packaging. Maintenance (often janitorial) work was relatively easy to find, but usually served as a "stepping stone" to another job with better hours and working conditions, or as a second (moonlighting) job in the evenings. Lumber yards have proved a good source of jobs. In both cities, the types of jobs sought and found have grown more diverse over the life of the FASP project. The types of jobs obtained, along with the time needed to obtain them and the wage history, are shown on a one-by-one basis for all sample adults in Tables 19 and 20.

Almost all the North Carolina FASP refugees who have obtained employment have been referred to their jobs by the resettlement agency employment specialists. There were one or two exceptions, such as one Charlotte refugee who refused a job that was offered to him without sufficient cause (at least in the view of the agency staff). He was told to go on his own to interview for three jobs, and that after he searched on his own, CSS staff would again help him to find a job. However, one of his three interviews produced a job offer, which he accepted.

## Welfare Outcomes

About nine-tenths of all FASP refugees in North Carolina have been on AFDC or refugee cash assistance at one time or another. Both agencies took it for granted that a family would spend a month to three months on welfare upon arrival, but both worked very hard to find jobs for them and thus to make sure that each family was self-sufficient by the fourth month.[12] The exceptions to that policy occurred when a family had a forseeable need for Medicaid benefits and would not be likely to have sufficient medical benefits from employment. Examples of such situations are pregnancy and a need for surgery that would not be covered because of a "pre-existing conditions" clause in an employer's group insurance policy. In such cases — and they occurred fairly often — a family remained dependent on welfare for several months until their medical needs were resolved.

Table 21 shows the duration of cash assistance dependency among North Carolina's FASP refugees and points to some interesting

### Table 19

### Summary of Employment

### Random Sample of 22 FASP Cases in Charlotte

### January 1983 - March 1984

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed?* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Female, 45 | Not employed - refused job, moved away. | | | | |
| 4 | Female, 29 | 6 weeks | Textile worker | $3.50 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| 1 | Male, 25 | 4 weeks | Teacher aide | 4.07 | CSS | No, moved to WA |
| 2 | Female, 32 | #1: 4 weeks<br>#2: 13 weeks<br>#3: 3 weeks | Textile worker<br>Textile worker<br>Textile worker | 3.35<br>3.35<br>3.55 | CSS<br>CSS<br>CSS | No, health<br>No, quit<br>Yes |
| 3 | Female, 30 | 3 weeks | Bakery | 4.25 | CSS | Yes |
| 4 | Male, 38 | 20 weeks | Textile | 3.50 | CSS | Yes ($5.05) |
| | Female, 36 | 13 weeks | Textile | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($5.20) |
| 6 | Female, 45 | Not employed (health) | | | | Moved |
| | Male, 23 | 13 weeks | Electronics | 3.50 | CSS | No, moved |
| | Male, 20 | 7 weeks | Textile | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($4.91) |
| 3 | Male, 28 | | Textile | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($4.00) |
| | Female, 23 | 10 weeks | Textile | 3.55 | CSS | Yes ($4.89) |
| 6 | Male, 38 | 30 weeks (health) | Textile | 3.55 | | Yes |
| | Female, 38 | Not employed (health) | | | | |
| 1 | Male, 54 | #1: 22 weeks<br>#2: | Production worker<br>Production worker | 3.35<br>3.55 | | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($8.79) |
| 6 | Male, 48 | #1: 35 weeks<br>#2: 10 weeks | #1: Maintenance<br>#2: Textile | 3.35 | CSS | No, fired<br>Yes ($3.55) |
| | Female, 45 | #1: 20 weeks<br>#2: 1 week | #1: Textile<br>#2: Textile | 3.35<br>3.35 | CSS<br>CSS | No, laid off<br>Yes ($3.65) |
| 5 | Female, 29 | 7 weeks | Restaurant | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($4.79) |
| | Male, 24 | #1: 5 weeks<br>#2: 10 days | #1: Construction<br>#2: Textile | 3.50<br>3.50 | CSS<br>CSS | No, laid off<br>Yes ($4.06) |
| | Female, 19 | #1: 7 weeks<br>#2: 10 days | #1: Textile<br>#2: Textile | 3.35<br>3.50 | CSS<br>CSS | No, laid off<br>Yes ($3.95) |
| 1 | Male, 28 | 14 weeks | Maintenance | 5.62 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| 4 | Male, 33 | 4 weeks | Maintenance | 3.35 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| | Male, 22 | 4 weeks | Maintenance | 3.35 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| | Female, 28 | Not employed | | | | |
| 6 | Male, 36 | 20 weeks | Steel worker | 4.00 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| | Female, 29 | Not employed | (Young children) | | | |
| 2 | Female, 30 | 8 weeks<br>Not reemployed | Production worker<br>(New baby) | 4.25 | CSS | No, couldn't do work |
| 5 | Male, 26 | 13 weeks | Textile | 3.55 | CSS | ? |
| | Female, 26 | Not employed | (Young children) | | | |

*It was not always possible to distinguish from agency records whether or not changes in jobs had occurred.

Table 19 (continued)

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed?* |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 8 | Male, 43 | 20 weeks | Furniture repair | $4.50 | CSS | Yes ($5.00) |
| | Female, 42 | Not employed | (New baby) | | | |
| 3 | Male, 29 | 9 weeks | Textile | 3.55 | CSS | No, moved to CA |
| | Female, 30 | Not employed | (New baby) | | | |
| 3 | Male, 29 | 5 weeks | Textile | 3.50 | CSS | Yes ($3.50) |
| | Female, 23 | 9 weeks | Textile | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($3.35) |
| 9 | Female, 59 | Not employed (age) | | | | |
| | Female, 22 | #1: 6 weeks | Textile | 3.50 | CSS | No, left for #2 |
| | | #2: — | Production worker | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($4.32) |
| | Female, 20 | #1: 4 weeks | Production worker | 3.50 | CSS | No, left for #2 |
| | | #2: — | Textile | 3.50 | CSS | Yes ($4.61) |
| | Female, 19 | 4 weeks | Production worker | 3.50 | CSS | Yes ($4.93) |
| | Male, 31 | 6 weeks | Textile | 3.55 | CSS | Yes ($4.50) |
| 6 | Male, 46 | 26 weeks | Textile | 3.55 | CSS | Yes ($4.70) |
| | Female, 35 | 10 weeks | Textile | 3.35 | CSS | Yes ($4.65) |

*It was not always possible to distinguish from agency records whether or not changes in jobs had occurred.

Source: FASP MIS and agency records

### Table 20

### Summary of Employment

### Random Sample of 22 FASP Cases in Greensboro

### January 1983 - March 1984

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Length of Time Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Wage | Services Utilized Obtaining Job | Still Employed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 5 | Male, 46 | 20 weeks | Furniture industry | $3.70 | LFS | Yes ($4.00) |
| | Female | Not employed | (May be looking) | | | |
| 3 | Male, 27 | #1: 10 weeks<br>#2: 20 weeks | #1:Furniture industry<br>#2:Jeweler | 3.35<br>4.00 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($4.25) |
| | Female, 26 | Not employed | (New baby) | | | |
| 6 | Male, 27 | 10 weeks | Jeweler | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($4.25) |
| | Female, 26 | 22 weeks | Jeweler | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($3.50) |
| | Male, 58 | Not employed | (Not looking) | | | |
| 7 | Male, 43 | 11 weeks | Furniture industry | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($6.00) |
| | Female, 42 | 26 weeks | Maintenance worker | 3.35* | LFS | Yes |
| 5 | Male, 30 | 34 weeks (disabled) | Furniture industry | 3.70 | LFS | Yes ($3.50) |
| | Female, 26 | Not employed | (New baby) | | | |
| 6 | Male, 50 | 17 weeks (medical) | Furniture industry | 3.70 | LFS | Yes ($4.00) |
| | Female, 37 | Not employed | (New baby) | | | |
| 7 | Male, 36 | 12 weeks | Maintenance worker | 3.49 | LFS | Yes ($3.84) |
| | Female, 41 | Not employed | (Young children) | | | |
| 6 | Male, 40 | 20 weeks | Furniture industry | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($4.25) |
| | Female, 35 | 33 weeks | Maintenance worker | 3.35 | LFS | Yes |
| 5 | Male, 28 | #1:39 wks (school)<br>#2: — | Upholsterer<br>Upholsterer | 3.75<br>4.00 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes |
| | Female, 26 | #1:39 wks (school)<br>#2: — | Industrial sewing<br>Industrial sewing | 4.00<br>4.25 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($4.25) |
| | Male, 24 | 10 weeks | Upholsterer | 4.00 | LFS | Yes ($4.50) |
| | Male, 18 | 20 weeks | Yard work | 3.35 | Summer CETA Program | Yes, part-time after school |
| 5 | Male, 33 | #1: 13 weeks<br>#2: 4 weeks<br>#3: | #1: Factory worker<br>#2: Lumber yard<br>#3: Maintenance wkr. | 3.35<br>3.40<br>3.35* | LFS<br>LFS<br>LFS | No, plant closed<br>Yes ($4.00) } both<br>Yes ($3.50) } |
| | Female, 38 | Not employed | (May be looking) | | | |
| 4 | Male, 46 | #1: 10 weeks<br>#2: 26 weeks | #1: Maintenance wkr.<br>#2: Leather industry | 3.35*<br>3.35 | LFS<br>LFS | Yes ($3.50) } both<br>Yes ($3.50) } |
| | Female, 38 | #1: 9 weeks<br>#2: — | #1: Furniture industry<br>#2: Metal worker | 3.50<br>3.35 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($4.00) |
| 7 | Male, 48 | 11 weeks | Metal manufacturing | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($4.00) |
| | Female, 49 | #1: 17 weeks<br>#2: — | #1: Maintenance wkr.<br>#2: Furniture indus. | 3.35*<br>3.70 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($4.00) |
| | Male, 18 | 10 days | Maintenance worker | 3.35 | LFS | No, school |
| 1 | Female, 29 | 6 weeks | Furniture industry | 3.50 | LFS | No, moved to NH |

*Indicates part-time

Table 20 (continued)

| Number in Household | Description of Employable Individual(s) | Till Employment Obtained | Occupation | Wage | Services Utilized in Obtaining Job | Still Employed |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Male, 28 | #1: 4 weeks<br>#2: — | #1: Furniture indus.<br>#2: Metal worker | $3.50<br>3.35 | LFS<br>LFS | No, left for #2<br>Yes ($4.00) |
|  | Female, 29 | Not employed | (Not looking yet) |  |  |  |
| 5 | Male, 36 | #1: 13 weeks<br>#2: 6 weeks | #1: Lumber industry<br>#2: Lumber industry | 3.35<br>3.35 | LFS<br>LFS | No, laid off<br>Yes ($3.75) |
|  | Female, 30 | Not employed | (New baby) |  |  |  |
| 5 | Male, 39 | #1: 4 weeks<br>16 weeks<br>#2: 18 weeks<br>#3: — | #1: Furniture indus.<br>Maintenance wkr.<br>#2: Leather industry<br>#3: Furniture indus. | 4.00<br>3.35*<br>3.35<br>3.70 | LFS<br>LFS<br>LFS<br>LFS | No, health<br>Yes ($3.50)<br>No, plant closed<br>Yes ($4.00) } both |
|  | Female, 33 | Not employed | (May be looking) |  |  |  |
| 2 | Male, 39 | 13 weeks | Furniture industry | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($4.15) |
|  | Female, 32 | Not employed | (New baby) |  |  |  |
| 5 | Male, 43 | 5 weeks | Maintenance worker<br>Furniture industry | 3.35*<br>3.70 | LFS<br>LFS | Yes ($3.50)<br>Yes ($4.00) } both |
|  | Female, 33 | Not employed | (Not looking yet) |  |  |  |
| 7 | Male, 42 | 4 weeks | Furniture industry | 3.35 | LFS | Yes ($3.75) |
|  | Female, 42 | Self-employed | (Day care in home) | ? | Self | Yes |
| 8 | Male, 55 | #1: 26 weeks<br>#2: 20 weeks | #1: Lumber industry<br>#2: Furniture indus. | 3.40<br>3.70 | LFS<br>LFS | No, couldn't do work<br>Yes ($3.90) |
|  | Female, 35 | Not employed | (Young children) |  |  |  |
| 2 | Male, 37 | 10 weeks | Mechanic trainee | 3.75 | LFS | Yes ($4.00) |
|  | Female | 16 weeks | Teacher | 3.48 | LFS | Yes |
| 5 | Male, 35 | P1: 7 weeks<br>#2: — | #1: Leather industry<br>#2: Furniture indus. | 3.35<br>3.70 | LFS<br>LFS | No, plant closed<br>Yes ($4.50) |
|  | Female, 30 | Not employed | (Not looking) |  |  |  |

*Indicates part-time

## Table 21

## Duration of Welfare Benefits

## All North Carolina FASP Refugees

## March 1984

| | Charlotte | | | | Greensboro | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| | Number | | Percent of | | Number | | Percent of | |
| Duration | Cases | Individuals | Cases | Individuals | Cases | Individuals | Cases | Individuals |
| Never received | 1 | 1 | 1% | — | 10 | 50 | 18% | 23% |
| 1 month | 2 | 10 | 2% | 3% | 0 | 0 | — | — |
| 2 months | 26 | 69 | 28% | 23% | 6 | 31 | 11% | 14% |
| 3 months | 24 | 56 | 26% | 19% | 9 | 38 | 16% | 17% |
| 4 months | 17 | 80 | 19% | 27% | 8 | 31 | 14% | 14% |
| 5 months | 6 | 33 | 7% | 11% | 2 | 10 | 4% | 5% |
| 6 months | 5 | 18 | 5% | 6% | 5 | 12 | 9% | 5% |
| 7 months | 2 | 9 | 2% | 3% | 0 | 0 | — | — |
| 8 months | 0 | 0 | — | — | 3 | 16 | 5% | 7% |
| Over 8 months | 1 | 4 | 1% | 1% | 1 | 8 | 2% | 4% |
| Ongoing (March) | 8[a] | 19 | 9% | 6% | 13[a] | 26 | 23% | 12% |
| Total | 91[b] | 198 | 100% | 99% | 57[b] | 220 | 102%[c] | 100%[c] |

Source: Agency records and Income Maintenance MIS

[a] Of these 21 cases, 12 consisted of individuals within households where other family members were working, but where the family composition means that they are eligible for a supplementary cash grant (four in Charlotte, eight in Greensboro). The remainder consists of families in which the only "employable" adults have medical barriers to employment (two in Charlotte, three in Greensboro) or cannot work because of child care responsibilities (two in each city).

[b] This is larger than the number of FASP families resettled because of the procedure for "splitting" households for cash grant purposes when family composition permits.

[c] Figures do not add to 100% because of rounding.

differences in agency resettlement practices. In Charlotte, virtually every FASP refugee received welfare at some time, though the vast majority were self-sufficient by the fourth month after arrival. It was the practice of CSS to help refugees apply for cash assistance within days after arrival. In that way, the agency was able to utilize USCC grant funds to assist each family with rent and utility payments once they had a job and were becoming self-sufficient. In Greensboro, on the other hand, by using the Welcome House, LFS was able to feed and house new arrivals in an economical way for several weeks after arrival, and so the application for cash assistance was usually delayed until each family was moved to a permanent residence. For this reason, ten of their 42 FASP families never received any cash assistance, since they were employed soon after arrival.

Of the 21 cash assistance cases still open in March of 1984, only nine included heads of household. These consisted of widows with very young children and families with adults who were either too old, or ill, or disabled to be expected to work. Some of these will soon become SSI cases, a few others were expected to be employable within a few months. The twelve remaining open cases consisted of individuals within households (such as teenagers attending school full time and older family members) whose cash assistance grant acts as a supplement to the family's earned income.

Of the 18 families that moved away from Charlotte prior to September 1983, all but one had previously been on welfare. Only three of those had their benefits terminated because of employment prior to outmigration. Seven of these eighteen families showed no record of having received Food Stamps (the date of application was recorded, but no amount was entered). This may be because they moved soon enough after applying that stamps were never actually received.

Of the 19 sample families who remained in Charlotte, the only one with no record of receiving cash assistance was a new arrival. At least 15 of the 19 families had received Food Stamps (though others may have received stamps but combined into a single allotment with another family living in the same household). No ending dates for Food Stamps were shown on the FASP MIS input form, since even those refugees who were employed were often still receiving a Food Stamp supplement.

## Migration Outcomes

Of the 111 FASP families who were resettled in North Carolina, eighteen (or 77 persons) had moved to another state at the time of the initial BPA site visit in September, 1983. Secondary migrants included approximately 14% of FASP refugees. The patterns of (and reasons for) this early migration require further exploration, which brings to light several key factors:

- All eighteen of these early migrant cases were initially resettled in Charlotte. The Greensboro site had experienced no outmigration at all until after the end of the FASP year.
- The circumstances under which Charlotte's FASP refugees migrated away were notable. Thirteen of the eighteen families were known to have been assisted and encouraged in their migration by representatives of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS or Mormon church). Most of the other cases appeared to have been influenced by contacts with earlier migrants, who in turn were influenced by the Mormons. The details of the refugee-LDS problem are discussed below.
- There were no significant differences in the characteristics or employment experiences between those refugees who left and those who remained. An analysis of all early migrant cases compared to the random sample of (19) FASP families who remained in Charlotte appears below.

Between the time of the first and second BPA field visits, another sixteen families (or 81 persons) moved away from Charlotte, for a total outmigration of 158 persons or 52% of all Charlotte FASP refugees. The later cases all moved to California; CSS staff believed strongly that the lure of welfare benefits was the principal reason for migration, though the refugees stated they were going to join relatives or friends.

Several large groups traveled together, and they have applied for welfare since arrival in California.

Two cases of migration from Greensboro occurred between the end of the FASP year and the second BPA site visit. Both moved to join relatives in other states, though in one case a contributing factor may have been the possibility of increasing the family's income through more generous welfare benefits.

At the same time, Greensboro appears to be a target for a substantial amount of secondary in migration. By March of 1984, ten Cambodian families (33 individuals) had arrived in order to join friends or relatives there, and additional cases were being reported each week.

### The Effects of Mormon Influence on Migration

One circumstance in particular created an unprecedented challenge for resettlement agency staff in the FASP demonstrations in North Carolina: the conflicts caused by the missionary activities of the Church of Jesus Christ of Latter Day Saints (LDS or Mormon church). The details of these activities have been exhaustively documented in letters and memoranda from the two resettlement agencies to ORR, as well as internally within ORR. LDS missionary activities in Charlotte began early in 1983, while in Greensboro sporadic 1983 contacts with refugees were unsuccessful, but were followed by more intensive activities during 1984. LDS missionary activities, as observed and reported by other refugees and occasionally by resettlement agency staff, consisted of going from door to door, often with the help of their own Cambodian interpreter. Some of the refugees who were frightened by this contact from strangers later reported to resettlement agency staff that the Mormons had offered gifts and had tried to convince the refugees to rely on them (rather than on the sponsoring agency) for assistance, while at the same time recruiting them as potential new church members. Some of the reported missionaries' statements to the refugees seemed specifically designed to undermine refugee trust in resettlement agency staff. In fact resettlement agency staff reported increasing difficulties communicating with some of the families who had become Mormon church members.

During the spring of 1983, which was the period of heaviest LDS activity in Charlotte, 13 families moved away from Charlotte. The first eight of these left secretly, without letting Catholic Social Services staff know that they were leaving, often in the middle of the night, and always (according to reports from other refugee observers) with the assistance of the LDS missionaries, who drove them to the bus station and paid for some of their travel expenses. Agency staff were limited (both legally and by a policy of religious non-interference) in what they could do to counteract the perceived destabilizing influence of refugee contact with Mormons. Staff were frustrated by the amount of time and effort it had taken to try to discourage LDS involvement with the FASP refugees. Gradually, toward the end of the FASP demonstration year, tensions between the Mormon FASP refugees and Charlotte agency staff eased, (though many more of these refugees had moved away), and the group which remained in March of 1984 were working, saving money, taking pride in their families' accomplishments, and planning for the future.

### Comparison of Migrating and Non-Migrating Families

Examination of the characteristics and experiences of 19 non-migrating FASP families in Charlotte (the 22 randomly selected families with the exception of those three families who moved) and the 18 initial migrant families who moved away prior to October 1983 shows very few significant differences between the two groups. Table 22 summarizes case characteristics and shows that family size and composition were similar in the two groups. Table 23 compares the education, English language proficiency, and employment history of the two groups. In general, the migrant group was the better-educated, but had slightly lower English language attainment and fewer adults with experience in skilled occupations than did the non-migrant group.

Table 24 shows that comparable numbers of migrants and non-migrants were employed within three months of arrival. A larger percentage of migrants than non-migrants were employed as textile workers, which was the predominant area in which entry-level job opportunities were available in Charlotte. The wage patterns were substantially similar for the

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 22

## Case Characteristics of Samples of Migrating and Non-Migrating FASP Families Charlotte, North Carolina

| Family Size: | Migrants | Non-Migrants |
|---|---|---|
| 1-2 persons | 4 | 4 |
| 3-4 persons | 6 | 7 |
| 5-6 persons | 6 | 6 |
| 7 or more persons | 2 | 2 |
| Total | 18 | 19 |
| Family Composition: | | |
| Single person: | 2 | 3 |
| Childless couple: | 1 | 2 |
| Intact Family: | 7 | 4 |
| Missing Parent: | 7 | 7 |
| Family Fragments: | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 18 | 19 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 23

## Characteristics of FASP Adults

## Samples of Migrants and Non-Migrants
## Charlotte, North Carolina

| Years of Education: | Migrants | Non-Migrants |
|---|---|---|
| None | 7 | 15 |
| 1-3 | 11 | 11 |
| 4-6 | 9 | 10 |
| 7-9 | 3 | 5 |
| 10 or more | 4 | 2 |
| Total | 34 | 43 |
| **ESL Level at Arrival:** | | |
| None | 4 | 8 |
| Level A | 12 | 10 |
| Level B | 4 | 8 |
| Level C | 5 | 7 |
| Level D or above | 5 | 7 |
| Unknown | 4 | 3 |
| Total | 34 | 43 |
| **Pre-Camp Work Experience** | | |
| Farmer | 8 | 10 |
| Student/military | 13 | 15 |
| Skilled occupations | 1 | 7 |
| Professional/Administrative Occupations | 3 | 2 |
| None or unknown | 9 | 9 |
| Total | 34 | 43 |

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

## Table 24

## U.S. Employment Experiences
## Samples of Migrants and Non-Migrants
## Charlotte, North Carolina

| Time Between Arrival and Hire: | Migrants | Non-Migrants |
|---|---|---|
| 1-6 weeks | 6 | 9 |
| 7-12 weeks | 6 | 7 |
| 13-18 weeks | 0 | 4 |
| 19-24 weeks | 1 | 3 |
| 25 or more weeks | 1 | 1 |
| (Not employed) | 20 | 21 |
| Total | 34 | 43 |
| **Occupation:** | | |
| Textile worker | 11 | 13 |
| Other manufacturing | 0 | 3 |
| Maintenance | 0 | 4 |
| Restaurant | 1 | 1 |
| Other | 2 | 1 |
| Total | 14 | 22 |
| **Wages:** | | |
| $3.35-3.49 | 7 | 10 |
| $3.50-3.74 | 6 | 9 |
| $3.75 and over | 1 | 3 |
| Total | 14 | 22 |

two groups, though patterns of production-based pay within the textile industry make it impossible to compare actual earnings.

One other factor that is usually thought to affect migration patterns is the existence of relatives in other states. In Charlotte, the known differences between the migrant and non-migrant groups were too minor to account for the migration observed. One person from each group had a brother or sister living elsewhere. In addition, two of the migrant group had cousins living in other states.

In most cases, families' decisions to migrate were reported to be influenced not only by LDS contact, but also by other factors. The actual assignment of computer codes to the "reason for leaving" category in the MIS was a combination of staff judgment as to the reasons and the stated or documented reason. Half of the families were perceived as having been attracted by higher welfare benefits, one-third stated that they were going to join relatives (some of whom had not been listed on their biodata sheets), and one went to be near a friend. Two thirds of these families (or 12 families) went to California, two went to the state of Washington, and others migrated to the states of Utah, Connecticut, Georgia, and Minnesota.

The first instance of secondary migration occurred in mid-March, about six weeks after the migrating family had arrived in Charlotte. The elapsed time between arrival and departure for those who migrated prior to October 1983 were the following:

| | |
|---|---|
| Less than 1 month: | 3 (17%) |
| 1-2 months: | 5 (28%) |
| 3-4 months: | 7 (39%) |
| More than 4 months: | 3 (17%) |

Of the 18 early migrant families, 17 applied for welfare in their destination state. The one remaining family returned to Charlotte, and the head of household was able to find employment, though he had not been employed before leaving.

### Outcomes Related to the Relationship Between the Refugee and Larger Communities in Charlotte and Greensboro

FASP agencies, with the concurrence of the state and the Regional Director, adopted a conscious policy of keeping the FASP project out of the limelight, in order to avoid any negative public reaction that might accompany an overly-visible project. They also made special efforts to keep community relationships with FASP refugees positive. Such efforts included attention to coverage of refugee-related issues by the lcoal media. A few newspaper articles in Greensboro stressed the positive nature of refugee resettlement over the past several years and focused on several "human interest" stories involving members of the FASP group. One such story was about an elderly woman who had been totally blind for over two years, for whom a surgeon and hospital had donated the necessary surgery and services to restore her sight. Newspaper attention in Charlotte was directed for the most part at the tensions between Catholic Social Services and the LDS church. A more positive event in Charlotte which caught the attention of the media appears to have been important as a factor in stabilizing the local ethnic community. The organizing and opening of a new Buddhist temple was encouraged and facilitated by the CSS Refugee Office, in response to a genuine need in the community, but also in order to increase the cohesiveness of the Cambodian group and thus the success of the FASP demonstration. The official opening of the temple took place during a Buddhist festival time, and was the occasion for a visit to Charlotte from a revered leader of the worldwide Cambodian Buddist community. A committee of FASP and former refugees were responsible for the organisational effort which brought about the temple, though they received a great deal of help and support from Catholic Social Services. This committee elected a leader and took on significant responsibilities, not the least of which was the responsibility for assuming rent payments on the temple site.

In Greensboro, a strong effort of Lutheran Family Services has been to build a cohesive community of Cambodian refugees. One concrete step was establishing a "Welcome House" for newly-arrived FASP refugees. This house served as the initial residence for all or nearly all FASP families. During the weeks when many families arrived and the search for permanent housing lagged, the Welcome House was home to as many as four or five families. These families had the opportunity to get to know each other — who was expert at repairing bicycles, who had good enough English to communicate with the sponsor, who was a good cook, who had children the same age, etc. — before settling into their respective apartments. LFS also made conscious attempts to arrange housing so that each FASP family had an apartment within the same block as one or more other FASP families and so that several such houses were within easy walking distance of each other. This arrangement facilitated carpooling to and from jobs. It also meant that, as time went by and a few FASP families obtained telephones, it became easier to transmit important messages by telephone to and from agency staff.

Another continuing effort was to hold community meetings every few weeks, usually on Saturday afternoons. All FASP refugees attended these meetings (which were still occurring regularly long after the demonstration year was over). These meetings solidified the sense of community among the FASP group itself and facilitated communication between agency staff and refugees. LFS in Greensboro also assisted in the formation of a Cambodian MAA, primarily for the purpose of seeking grant funding for continuing employment services. In addition, they applied for a foundation grant to establish a cultural center. Both of these efforts, if successful, will further strengthen the local Cambodian community.

## THE IMPORTANCE OF FASP DESIGN FEATURES IN NORTH CAROLINA

As was mentioned in Chapter II, the specific FASP design features to be examined include (1) resettlement in large ethnic "clusters," (2) designation of free cases, (3) selection of "favorable" alternate sites, (4) pre-existing refugees of the same ethnic group to be resettled, (5) overseas orientation, (6) additional social service allocation, (7) collaborative planning, (8) the MIS, and (9) an emphasis on case management. The extent to which each of these design features contributed to the success of FASP resettlement efforts varied between the two North Carolina sites.

(1) Resettling a single ethnic group in large number over a short period of time was generally viewed as being a good idea, facilitating the building of a sense of community among FASP refugees and enhancing the overall quality of their resettlement experience. The timing of arrivals and the size of the FASP group, while creating staff shortages and stress during the times of heavy influx, did allow for advance planning of workloads and accurate projections of need to other service providers in the community. CSS in Charlotte did state that, on a day-in and day-out basis, they felt sometimes unable to exert sufficient control over the flow and the characteristics (family composition) of arriving refugees. The size of the FASP group made it necessary for LFS in Greensboro to shift from its traditional emphasis on congregational sponsorships, so that the agency provided, for the first time, the full range of social services. However, LFS maintained strong ties with local churches of all denominations and benefitted from the volunteer talent and donations that these churches (along with other volunteers) made available to them. For CSS in Charlotte, FASP did not bring about any noticeable shifts in the volume or nature of their resettlement and service efforts.

(2) Neither agency expressed particular problems associated with the resettlement of free cases with distant relatives in other states, though this was one minor factor which contributed to Charlotte's outmigration. The Program Administrator in Charlotte emphasized, however, that reunification of FASP families with their relatives still overeas should receive more attention in order to meet the most critical psychological needs of refugees -- both those already resettled and those still overseas.

(3) The selection of target communities for FASP is acknowledged to be extremely important. In addition to the adequacy of housing and entry-level employment opportunities, staff in both agencies stressed the importance of a receptive local community -- favorable media coverage, supportive "mainstream" social service providers, and a network of volunteer talent that can be tapped. Refugees stated that

the availability of good jobs was the most important factor in making North Carolina a good place to live.

(4) Staff in the two agencies did not subscribe to the notion of the critical importance of a pre-existing group of refugees of the same ethnic background as FASP arrivals. CSS had initially believed that group of Cambodians resettled in Charlotte during 1981 would act as a useful support system for the new arrivals. However, in retrospect, they felt that they benefitted only moderately from the voluntary assistance of the Cambodian "old-timers." The two groups were very different in economic and social characteristics. Except for some individual ties formed through living in the same neighborhood or joint involvement in Buddhist temple-related activities, the two groups did not integrate thoroughly. LFS in Greensboro stated that the sense of community that they were able to establish among the FASP group itself far outweighed any benefits that might have accrued from having an already-resettled group of Cambodians in the community. The refugees themselves were more interested in concrete help with Food Stamps and jobs than in building an ethnic community, though their participation in planning for ethnic and religious celebrations was enthusiastic.

(5) As was true in Arizona, the effects of any overseas orientation which took place were hardly noticeable in either North Carolina site. Of the North Carolina arrivals, it appeared that the refugees who arrived during early months did not see the prepared slide presentation. Of the later arrivals, often only heads of households saw the slides. Even then, many refugees appeared not to have absorbed very much of the information. Overseas orientation did not contribute as much to the FASP projects as had been envisioned, though resettlement agency staff felt that a meaningful orientation would have made their task easier. Perhaps the answer is that a more individualized approach to overseas orientation is needed, if that is possible and if there is enough time between refugees' notification of their selection for FASP and their actual departure. This appears to be a design element for which more documentation is needed, based on 1984 and subsequent FASP experience.

(6) The infusion of additional social service dollars into the FASP community was reported as being absolutely essential to the rapid resettlement and self-sufficiency of the arriving refugees. It is perhaps because of the characteristics of North Carolina's particular group of FASP refugees — largely rural with little educational attainment or employment experience and frequent needs for health services and sometimes mental health services — that their service needs were (and still are) urgent. Neither agency could have or would have taken on the responsibility of resettling this group without adequate resources to respond to their needs. The only reason that resources came close to being adequate was because CSS in Charlotte was able to combine the FASP allocation with its existing social service (RAP) contract with the state, and could thus "give" the majority of the FASP allocation to LFS in Greensboro (where there was no supplement until 1984 from state social service funding). The state has also responded further by directing some of its 1984 social service dollars to these two agencies for the post-FASP period (though at a reduced level in Charlotte). In other words, the FASP social service allocation by itself would have been far from sufficient.

(7) Collaborative planning is seen as one of the most important design features of the FASP demonstration. Inclusion of the state as a partner in the planning process has not only benefitted the local agencies, but also facilitated communications at all levels. Likewise, collaboration between the resettlement agency affiliates and other local officials, service providers, and volunteers has been essential to smooth project operation.

(8) The design and implementation of a FASP MIS to track refugee outcomes has been discussed above. During FASP implementation in North Carolina, the most noticeable part played by the MIS was to increase reporting burden. More time is needed to determine whether the usefulness in other states of a differently-designed system (benefitting from the lessons learned during 1983) will eventually outweigh the problems that were encountered during the start-up phase.

(9) The importance in these two sites of a FASP design emphasis on case management should not be over-emphasized. The two agencies

developed and used sound case management practices, but these practices were more a result of their own policies than they were a response to any external FASP design mandate. The one factor cited by LFS in Greensboro as the most important determinant of their success was staffing for the project. The purposeful recruitment of individuals who would willingly and cheerfully "give 150%" — who would be case managers 24 hours a day — has contributed more than anything else to their low outmigration rate and their success in helping the FASP group become employed and successfully adjusted. The effectiveness of such a small, almost overly-dedicated staff must be weighed against the threat of staff burnout.

## CHAPTER III FOOTNOTES

[1] U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1980 Final Count.

[2] U.S. Bureau of the Census, State and Metropolitan Area Data Book 1979 (A Statistical Abstract Supplement).

[3] North Carolina fact sheet prepared for overseas orientation of FASP refugees.

[4] LFS had had statewide responsibility for unaccompanied minors, and thus had developed the needed relationship with the State Refugee Coordinator.

[5] In fact, the State Refugee Coordinator believes, in retrospect, that that the MIS might have been a benefit rather than a hindrance to the program, if it had used microcomputers, with local data entry and centralized analysis. Such a design would have enabled the Coordinator to request or perform some of the analyses himself, rather than being wholly dependent upon the agency's programmers.

[6] Greensboro only reported detailed characteristics such as education and previous work experience for heads of household. Thus, the tables show missing information for other adult household members.

[7] These same data were submitted to ORR in the report from the North Carolina State Refugee Coordinator in March, 1984.

[8] It should be noted that the employment specialists in both agencies gathered and kept informally a great deal more information about previous experience and skills than was reflected in the FASP MIS data.

[9] Some FASP refugees have discovered that relatives have entered the refugee camps, but are in "undocumented" status. This means that if they are discovered by the Thai soldiers, they will be sent back to certain death in Cambodia.

[10] This is sometimes accomplished through carpools, with refugees sharing the cost. Employers and American co-workers have been particularly helpful in Greensboro, often providing transportation to and from work on a daily basis.

[11] LFS in Greensboro devised a special emergency procedure. Each refugee carried a small card with the home telephone numbers of all LFS staff, and a message something like the following in English: "My name is _______. I do not speak English. This is an emergency. Please call one of these numbers and tell them where I am. Thank you." This system was used successfully on several occasions. Thus, all LFS staff were on call at all times. CSS in Greensboro has a 24-hour hotline, and staff

rotated the "on call" responsibility.

[12] "Self-sufficient" is used here to mean earning an income. Though AFDC or RCA grants as soon as one family member was employed, most families continued to receive some Food Stamps, even though one or two adults were earning an income.

# IV. FINDINGS FROM THE FIRST PILOT DEMONSTRATION OF FASP

## THE SUCCESS OF FASP IN FURTHERING POSITIVE OUTCOMES FOR PROJECT PARTICIPANTS

### Methodological Issues

In order to assess how successful the first round FASP projects have been in achieving the stated project goals of (1) reducing welfare dependency rates, (2) increasing the ability of refugees at the FASP sites to become self-sufficient within a short period of time, and (3) reducing outmigration to impacted areas to the lowest possible level, it is necessary not only to look at the outcomes of resettlement for the FASP refugees, but also to compare their status to some other reference group or groups (e.g., other refugees entering the FASP locations during the same period or during earlier time periods, other refugees with similar characteristics in other sites around the country, or statistics from national research studies).

A comparison with other refugees who have been resettled in the first round FASP sites was difficult to accomplish because FASP refugees made up the majority of all refugees entering these sites during 1983. Previous refugee flows in these sites were often of a different ethnicity (e.g., in Arizona, where the predominant arrivals during 1981 and 1982 had been Polish and Cambodian, rather than Vietnamese) or else the previous resettlement outcomes were not sufficiently documented (as in the Khmer Guided Placement project in Phoenix and an informal previous Cambodian cluster project in Charlotte). Furthermore, comparisons with other resettlement outcomes at the same locations as the FASP projects would overlook the fact that a large part of the FASP design for effective free case resettlement has to do with selecting local labor markets with favorable characteristics, which would be duplicated for the comparison subjects.

Thus, in assessing whether the observed FASP outcomes are distinctive, we have compared them to several national or multi-site studies of refugee resettlement outcomes. These include preliminary findings from the Southeast Asian Refugee Self-Sufficiency Study conducted by the University of Michigan's Institute for Social Research for the Office of Refugee Resettlement, which has examined the resettlement outcomes for a sample of refugees who have been resettled in five sites around the U.S. between 1979 and 1982;[1] and findings on Refugee Earnings and Utilization of Financial Assistance Programs by David North at the Center for Labor and Migration Studies at New TransCentury Foundation,[2] based on Social Security files on taxable earnings of a 1975 cohort of Southeast Asian refugees, as well as estimates of the full range of assistance programs utilized by refugees who have arrived in the U.S. during different time periods since 1975. In addition, we have compared FASP outcomes to the preliminary findings from the 1982 Annual Survey of Southeast Asian Refugees, conducted for the Office of Refugee Resettlement by Opportunity Systems, Incorporated (OSI). In making each comparison, it is important to consider how the FASP refugees are similar to or different from these broader samples.

### Employment Outcomes

The employment outcomes reported for the refugees resettled under FASP in Arizona and North Carolina demonstrate that the project was an unqualified success in securing employment for the FASP refugees within a short period of time after arrival. In all sites, at least one family member in each FASP household was employed within three to four months after arrival[3] (in Phoenix, the average length of time until employment was obtained was one month to six weeks; in the remaining sites, two to three months was more usual).

Furthermore, by the time of the return site visit in March of 1984, it became apparent that FASP households were progressing towards full economic self-sufficiency by having employable adults enter the labor force at a high rate and by working long hours. By March 1984, it was common for more than one adult per household to be working full time. It was also not uncommon for a single individual to hold more than one job, and for individuals to work significant numbers of voluntary or mandatory overtime hours at a single job. By March 1984, job turnover had occurred for a significant minority of FASP refugees, as they took the opportunity to move to an occupation more to their liking or with more opportunities for overtime work. In many cases, the second or third job was obtained by the refugee him- or herself, without assistance from a service agency.

The most frequent types of employment obtained included textile factory work (Charlotte and Phoenix), furniture making (Greensboro), and product assembly, including electronic assembly (Tucson). A wide range of jobs were held, however, ranging from termite control sprayer to construction worker to working in a bagel bakery. Minimum wage employment was most common at first, and small but steady advances in salary levels through regularly scheduled pay increases or increases in production-based pay were apparent by the time of the return visit in March 1984.

The distinctiveness of the FASP employment outcomes becomes apparent upon comparing these outcomes to statistics from other studies. The University of Michigan's Southeast Asian Refugee Resettlement Study found that the percentages of refugee households with at least one employed member during the first year after arrival did not exceed 35%. Similarly, the 1982 OSI survey found that only 25% of refugee individuals age 16 or older participated in the labor force during the first year after entry.

Despite the clearly outstanding success of the FASP experiment, it is important to recognize that, while the FASP outcomes described above are a tribute to the design of the FASP program, with good employment opportunities available in the local labor market, as well as to the industriousness of the FASP arrivals, they are also, in large part, a reflection of the lack of attractiveness of "the welfare option" in the particular FASP sites. As we shall see in a later section, a substantial minority of FASP arrivals in three of the four sites decided to pursue a less self-sufficient life style, and moved to a state with more generous welfare payments (usually California) in order to do this.

**Welfare Outcomes**

Not surprisingly, there was a strong association in both Arizona and North Carolina between the high rates of employment and low rates of welfare dependency by the end of the 12-month FASP demonstration period.[4] Thus, the North Carolina and Arizona FASP projects both exhibited much lower welfare participation rates than the typical refugee experience suggested by our comparison surveys. By early 1984, welfare participation rates for FASP individuals in the first round states ranged from a low of less than 1% in Phoenix to 9% in Charlotte, 13% in Greensboro, and 27% in Tucson.[5] In many cases, these grants were supplements to earned income. These welfare dependency outcomes are distinctly divergent from the "typical" refugees experience, as suggested by the 1982 OSI survey, which found that 82% of all survey respondents received cash assistance at some time during their first year in the U.S. and 75% of all respondents received cash assistance at some time during their second year after arrival. David North's estimates of 1983 cash assistance participation rates by year of entry show similarly high rates through the second year (80% welfare participation the first year and 64% the second year).

It is important to note that the FASP sites achieved their low welfare dependency outcomes by applying widely different philosophies and practices about the utilization of welfare as an interim stage in the adjustment process. In both North Carolina sites, the interim receipt of cash assistance (and the associated medical assistance) was taken for granted, and most FASP refugees were assisted in enrolling in public assistance programs soon after arrival.[6] In Arizona, a more cautious approach was taken towards the interim receipt of cash assistance. Attempts to avoid enrollment of FASP refugees in cash grant programs was made possible in Arizona because the state offers refugees access to a refugee medical assistance program which is operated independently of the cash assistance system. In Phoenix, the resettlement agencies strenuously avoided welfare receipt for FASP clients by obtaining employment for them before the agency's or congregation's reception and placement funds were exhausted. This effort was almost totally successful. In Tucson, refugees who were not able to obtain employment by the end of the second or third month after arrival were assisted in signing up for cash assistance, and between one-fourth and one-third of the FASP arrivals utilized AFDC or RCA grants at some time during the first year after arrival. Whichever approach to welfare receipt was used, welfare dependency appears to have been only a short-term transitional stage for most FASP households. Food Stamps have continued to supplement earned income for some of the larger FASP families over a longer period of time.

While the welfare outcomes for FASP refugees clearly demonstrate achievement of project goals, it is important to note that the low welfare participation rates in Arizona and North Carolina are heavily influenced by the low level of benefits available under the AFDC and RCA programs in these states. Thus, the differences between the FASP study findings and the more "typical" experience of newly-arriving refugees are, at least partly, a result of the environments in which the FASP demonstrations occurred, and would probably not be reproduced in a state with higher welfare benefits.

## Migration Outcomes

Accountability for migration outcomes is one of the most highly charged issues for resettlement agencies participating in FASP, perhaps because it is the outcome over which they feel they have least control. The resettlement agency staff who participated in FASP were adamant that the program's success should be judged on what it accomplished for the refugees who stayed in each site, not on the number of refugees who left. In this section, after presenting a summary of the secondary migration outcomes, we suggest some perspectives from which to assess the impact of the outmigration outcomes on the overall success of the FASP demonstration.

FASP secondary migration outcomes as of February 1984 can be summarized as follows:

| | |
|---|---|
| Greensboro: | 3% of FASP arrivals, |
| Charlotte: | 52% of FASP arrivals, |
| Tucson: | 27% of FASP arrivals, and |
| Phoenix: | 45% of FASP arrivals. |

The wide divergence of secondary migration outcomes between FASP sites in the same states is apparent, as is the considerable rate of outmigration from Charlotte and Phoenix.

Our observation of the FASP projects and discussions with refugees as well as project staff suggest that the outmigration phenomenon occurred in two somewhat distinct phases. The first phase of secondary outmigration occurred early in the resettlement experience of the FASP refugees (within the first three months after arrival) and was almost always influenced by a desire to join friends or relatives in other locations in the U.S. In Charlotte, this early outmigration was complicated by the activities of missionaries from the Church of the Latter Day Saints (Mormons) who assisted refugees to move. In Arizona, a number of FASP arrivals left after one or two months to join relatives (some of whom had not been listed in their biodata).

The second phase of secondary outmigration was comprised of FASP refugees who had been in the FASP sites for a longer period (four to 12 months) before they moved. Many of these households appeared to outside observers to be stably resettled, with jobs and achievement of at least partial self-sufficiency. Although most FASP refugees who left the FASP sites at this stage still reported that they were going to join friends or relatives, a potent lure in many of these cases appeared to be the opportunity for improving the household's financial status by moving to a state with generous welfare benefits (most often California). A small number of secondary migrants left to take advantage of better job opportunities elsewhere, but the majority, resettlement agencies said, applied for welfare in another state after they arrived.

The remaining questions of key interest for this study are:

- What caused the differential rates of outmigration from the different sites, and can anything be learned from the first round FASP sites about how to minimize secondary migration from future FASP sites?
- How should the outmigration rates be assessed, and what do they suggest about the overall success of the FASP demonstration projects?

Our observations and responses by resettlement actors in the different FASP sites did not enable us to isolate the definitive factors which explain the different outmigration rates from the different FASP sites. However, hypotheses include the following:

- that outmigration from Phoenix was greater than from Tucson because of the greater opposition to transitional welfare receipt on the part of the resettlement agencies in Phoenix;
- that the unquantifiable quality of personal staff relationships with individual FASP refugees makes a difference, and that, in Charlotte, the establishment of these personal relationships was made more difficult by the "competition" from Mormon missionaries. In addition, resettlement rules and practices were more formalized in Charlotte which had a long track record of agency sponsorship, compared to Greensboro, which had a new resettlement staff and the excitement of doing agency resettlement for the first time; and
- that, in each state, lower outmigration from the smaller city with fewer public transportation difficulties (Tucson and Greensboro) suggests that a "small town" atmosphere is more conducive to the development of a stable refugee community.

Staff in resettlement agencies which used congregational or individual sponsors also offered the observation that, no matter how wonderful the sponsor, their experience suggested that sponsor relationships could, at most, delay but not prevent outmigration by a FASP household.

With respect to the second question of how to evaluate the level of secondary migration which did occur under FASP, we would suggest three evaluation perspectives: (1) whether the outmigration rate was higher than usual secondary migration rates within the first year after refugee arrival in the U.S., (2) whether outmigration from the FASP sites endangered the viability or stability of the ongoing ethnic community of FASP refugees, and (3) how the outcomes for individual refugees varied from the outcomes that could have been expected under either a "dispersed" model of free case resettlement or a "concentrated" resettlement of free case refugees in areas which already had refugee populations.

Comparison to statistics on secondary migration rates from other studies suggests that the outmigration experienced under FASP was unusually high in Charlotte and Phoenix and unusually low in Greensboro. An analysis of data on the states which issued Social Security numbers to refugees who are currently receiving cash assistance[7] suggests that 25% of all welfare dependent refugees are living in a different state from the state in which they first arrived. These data also support the notion that outmigration is higher for those states with restrictive welfare eligibility criteria (i.e., no AFDC-U program) or lower benefits, such as North Carolina and Arizona. ORI survey data for 1982 also suggest relatively low secondary migration rate nationwide (24% of refugee respondents living in a different state from the state in which they were placed initially).

Another comparison point for the rate of secondary migration was offered by the national office of USCC, which says that it experiences 20% outmigration of USCC refugees from their initial resettlement site during the first 12-months after arrival.[8] Finally, the resettlement agencies at the FASP sites themselves report that outmigration rates under FASP have been lower than under the Cambodian cluster resettlement projects carried out in 1981.

Despite the fact that outmigration from at least two FASP sites occurred at a rate higher than the average secondary migration rate, the extent of outmigration that has occurred does not appear to have threatened the viability of the remaining ethnic support community in any of the four sites studied. In fact, the ethnic communities in these sites appear to be targeted for growth through both secondary in-migration from other sites (especially in Greensboro) and new refugee arrivals through family reunification with FASP clients. The family reunification process is occurring quite rapidly in North Carolina, and will take a longer time in Arizona because most relatives there still reside in Vietnam and need to go through the Orderly Departure Program (ODP) in order to leave Vietnam legally.

Finally, any effort to project what the welfare dependency rates and employment rates among the FASP clients would have been in the absence of FASP indicates that, most likely more refugees would have entered cash assistance caseloads, more would have stayed on welfare for an extended period, and fewer would have been employed at the end of 12 months after arrival under either a scattered free case resettlement pattern or a cluster resettlement in impacted sites than was the case under FASP. Thus, rather than seeing the high outmigration rates in two of the four FASP sites as evidence of the failure of the FASP demonstration, it makes more sense to see the program as being successful in giving the majority of refugee participants both the desire and the opportunity to become self-sufficient more rapidly than is usually the case.

## OBSERVATIONS ON THE INFLUENCE OF FASP DESIGN FEATURES ON THE SUCCESS OF THE DEMONSTRATION

In interviewing national, state, and local FASP actors and in observing the outcomes of the FASP demonstrations in the initial four sites, a central focus was on assessing the contribution of the major FASP design features to the success of the demonstration projects. The eight design features which have emerged from this study as key elements of the FASP program include the following:

- planned "cluster" resettlement of a defined ethnic group in a single location over a short period of time;
- the careful choice of FASP resettlement communities;
- the allocation of additional resources to FASP sites for employment-related social services;
- the coordination and cooperation of key actors at all levels;
- flexibility in the details of the FASP demonstration design;
- an emphasis on employment and on case management (service coordination) strategies;

- the prearrival orientation process; and
- the emphasis on accountability and the implementation of a FASP management information system (MIS).

## Cluster Resettlement

Perhaps the single most important element in the success of the FASP demonstration was simply the decision to resettle free case refugees in distinct, ethnically-grouped clusters over a relatively short period of time. Cluster resettlement allows refugees to retain their cultural identity; it gives them at least a chance at developing the type of support within the community that is particularly needed since they do not have the support of anchor relatives. The Buddhist temple in Charlotte and the numerous ethnic celebrations and festivals in all four sites are manifestations of the growth of stable communities that can be expected to serve as a magnet for future resettlement and secondary in-migration.

Cluster resettlement also appears to be efficient. It offers economies of scale in a time when relatively few free case refugees are arriving. The arrival of at least some minimum number of refugees — a "critical mass" -- ensures that the needed resettlement and service staff will be present to assist arriving refugees to attain rapid self-sufficiency.[9] Those voluntary resettlement agencies that adhere strongly to the individual or congregational sponsorship model of resettlement (or that are facing difficult resource allocation decisions associated with cutbacks) may see cluster resettlement as a disruption of their practices, since the volume and timing of arrivals generally require that the agency take on formal sponsorship responsibility. However, in the first round FASP states, those agencies that combined sponsorship responsibility with the extensive (and coordinated) use of individuals and congregations as volunteers during the FASP year found that this combination benefitted the arriving refugees while allowing for agency accountability for service outcomes.

## Other Critical Design Features

Several other elements of the FASP design appear to have been central factors in the projects' success. First of all, FASP communities were chosen with great care. ORR looked beyond the official unemployment rate and assessed the availability of particular types of jobs, namely entry-level jobs without an immediate need for English language skills, into which previous refugees had been successfully hired and assimilated. That care has paid off, as virtually every FASP refugee who is willing and able to work was employed by the time of the final field visit. Attention to the supply and cost of available housing was important, but perhaps even more crucial was attention to less tangible factors having to do with the community's receptivity to arriving refugees — factors such as the historical media coverage, absence of intergroup conflict, and capacity of the local voluntary structure. Maintaining good community relations has also been a focus of considerable effort on the part of resettlement and service agency staff, but it was important to start out in a supportive overall environment.

The success of the FASP demonstration also clearly hinged on the availability in each demonstration site of sufficient resources to support the service staff to provide the intensive, comprehensive, and individualized assistance the refugees needed in order to become self-sufficient soon after arrival. The per capita social service allocation that went along with FASP was indispensible. In three of the four first round FASP sites, the special social service allocation was supplemented by support from the state refugee social service funding structure. It would be questionable whether FASP incentive funding at its present level would be sufficient by itself to support the necessary social services to ensure successful client outcomes. It appears, though, that the extra resources invested in the FASP demonstration sites were well spent and have clearly contributed to the reduced welfare dependency and sucessful employment outcomes observed for FASP arrivals.

A third critical element in FASP success was the fact that a strong coordination effort was built into the design of the project -- coordination among federal agencies and national voluntary resettlement agency officials, with the state refugee coordinators, and among the key actors at the local level. The sense of shared purpose that accompanied this coordination contributed to the projects' success. Particularly in Arizona, where FASP resettlement and service responsibility were shared by many different actors at the local level and where the state's role was particularly active, the beneficial effects of FASP coordination appear likely to last well beyond the demonstration year.

Another crucial FASP design feature was the flexibility of the demonstration guidelines to allow for differing local circumstances and practices. This flexibility took a number of different forms and was important in several ways:

- Though it was initially deemed important to link FASP resettlement efforts to a group of already-resettled refugees of the same ethnic group as the new arrivals, FASP planning allowed for local variation about how and to what extent this should occur. In fact, the importance of the pre-existing refugee community appeared to vary from site to site. In Arizona, these earlier refugees were important as volunteers and friends. In North Carolina, one site found that the earlier group did not become involved with the FASP arrivals, while the other site neither had nor needed a pre-existing refugee group. More important appeared to be the sense of community that the resettlement agencies were able to build among the FASP refugees themselves.
- Likewise, the type or extent of specific involvement of mutual assistance associations (MAAs), was left up to each state. This meant that in Arizona, where MAA capability was strong, it could be used effectively. In North Carolina, on the other hand, there was no existing MAA capability, and therefore no defined MAA role. Rather, the agencies relied on those resources that were available. As a result, in both North Carolina sites, MAA capability is now growing and appears to offer promising resources for future resettlement efforts. In Arizona,

MAAs played both a formal service provider role as well as a less formal role in assisting resettlement agencies with reception and placement services.

- Finally, there was flexibility in the choice of resettlement practices and service models. This flexibility allowed agencies to build on their own successful experiences and to be responsive to the unique circumstances in each local area. For example:
  - one site was extremely successful with a reception center ("Welcome House") approach;
  - the agencies developed different ways of coordinating volunteer efforts;
  - one site used an effective refugee vocational training program; and
  - some sites relied on existing job placement services while others relied upon their own staff's job development capability.

An important FASP design element was the emphasis on employment and self-sufficiency along with a focus on case management, i.e., the individualized tracking of service needs and the planning and coordination of services to meet those needs. In order to respond to the strong overall mandate to assist refugees in achieving employment outcomes, a number of different service strategies and service coordination methods were used effectively, and nearly universal employment among employable adults was the result. Case management in some sites took the form of periodic interagency meetings to review those cases that showed signs of needing assistance to overcome employment barriers. In other sites, daily interaction among service staff was supplemented by weekly staff meetings at which individual service planning took place. Case management was undertaken more as an integral part of agencies' own efforts than it was in response to the FASP design. Nonetheless, it clearly contributed to the success of the demonstration.

One FASP design feature that appears to require further consideration is the special overseas orientation for FASP refugees.

Many refugees in both states had difficulty remembering or describing orientation materials. Some refugees never received the information; others may have had difficulty absorbing the information. Resettlement agency staff in both states generally believed that refugees would benefit from knowing more about their future homes and about what to expect upon arrival, and that this FASP design element should not be dropped, but rather should be the subject of further planning and development. One suggestion was that a more individualized way of presenting the information would make it more meaningful to the refugees. Another observation was that overseas orientation must be supplemented by on-site orientation soon after arrival in the FASP site.

The final design element that was specifically built into the FASP demonstration was a set of procedures for accountability and the development of a management information system (MIS) to track refugee characteristics, services, and outcomes. The focus on accountability was beneficial in several ways:

- the focus on accountability (along with the "self-consciousness" that stems from being part of a national pilot) stimulated service agency staff awareness of the importance of achieving positive outcomes for each refugee household;
- the reporting requirements that accompanied the MIS likewise increased the awareness of outcomes and caused each agency to collect complete and comparable information about each refugee; and
- the state monitoring function appeared helpful, ensuring that each agency's procedures for gathering and reporting information were adequate.

The automated management information system themselves were more problematic. They consumed a great deal of time and effort at both the state and local levels. In Arizona, that effort may eventually pay off, as the system was recently expanded to include all refugees in the state. In North Carolina, everyone involved agreed that the MIS was not worth the effort; it was discontinued as soon as possible after the end of the FASP demonstration. In neither state was the MIS able to produce during the demonstration period the summary analyses that had been anticipated, such as analyses of the relationships between refugee characteristics and observed outcomes or between services received and outcomes.

The disappointing performance of the FASP MIS may mean only that it takes longer than a year to build an MIS "from the ground up". It should be possible for future FASP sites to benefit from Arizona's and North Carolina's experiences and therefore to get a head start in building a system that will be useful in future efforts. State-level actors also observed that it is important to consider the characteristic of the state agency's information system, if a FASP MIS is to be incorporated into such a system, and that a free-standing system using microcomputers may prove more flexible and easier to implement. There appears to be a need for a way of consolidating and passing along the lessons to be learned from the development of the FASP (and perhaps other refugee-related) MISs.

## LESSONS FOR FUTURE FASP RESETTLEMENT EFFORTS

After meeting at the national level to plan for the design of the 1984 FASP projects, a number of the actors involved in FASP agreed on the need for several program design refinements. These included: (1) the need to make sure the capacity of any single resettlement agency was not exceeded in future FASP plans. Specifically, it was agreed that 200 arrivals in a six-month period per resettlement agency was likely to be a maximum limit, and that a commitment to resettle 300 FASP arrivals might be "asking for trouble"; and (2) the need to permit states to pass along a portion of the incentive social service dollars to resettlement agencies to support their added costs in tracking refugees' status. A remaining concern on the part of some national resettlement agencies and their local affiliates is how to maintain sufficient staff to provide necessary follow-on services to FASP refugees after the demonstration project is officially over. This could become an expensive proposition for resettlement agencies, if the number of new arrivals is sharply reduced after FASP ends.

Experience with the FASP program in the first two pilot states has also revealed the tremendous importance of the characteristics of the FASP refugees themselves in influencing project outcomes. The FASP clients in North Carolina and Arizona were sharply dissimilar. In Arizona, Vietnamese FASP arrivals had been in refugee camps between ten months and two years. They were often single young males without families to support (at least in the U.S.). Serious health conditions were infrequent among Arizona's FASP refugees. In contrast, the Cambodian FASP arrivals in South Carolina had, on average, been in refugee camps for at least three years. As a result, they had more need for intensive health services and perhaps greater habits of dependency when they arrived. North Carolina's FASP cases were also most often families with children, including female-headed families with children. These differences in refugee characteristics affected not only the number of households where one or more adults was available for work, but also the minimum earnings necessary to support the household. Because of the importance of these particular client factors, those planning future FASP projects should be careful about the extent to which the findings from these first FASP sites can be generalized.

## THE SUCCESS OF FASP IN FURTHERING THE NATIONAL PLACEMENT POLICY OBJECTIVES

In addition to examining the effectiveness of the FASP resettlement approach for individual FASP refugees, it is important to assess the effectiveness of FASP as part of the larger strategy for implementing refugee placement policy (i.e., influencing the nationwide distribution of refugees by avoiding impacted sites for resettlement). When the FASP design was first suggested, it was seen as closely related to the decision to stop placing free cases (including refugees with distant relatives in the U.S.) in impacted areas such as California. The idea was that FASP sites would open up alternative locations for resettlement of those refugees with distant relatives in impacted areas who are no longer eligible for family reunification with their relatives.

The FASP demonstration projects have proved successful in absorbing the flow of free cases under the expanded definition of free case. It is sometimes argued, though, that such projects may no longer be essential in order to absorb the current volume of free cases given reduced volumes of refugee arrivals. Arguments for continuing FASP under reduced refugee flows are that it is probably most efficient and more effective to continue to resettle free cases in clusters, in sites with good job opportunities, with attention to local resettlement agency and social service provider capabilities, and in large enough groups that the new arrivals will develop a sense of community among themselves and with pre-existing refugees. The expectation is that under these circumstances, free case refugees will be less likely to migrate to impacted areas than if they were to be settled in less "planned" patterns.

Arguments that FASP is no longer necessary in the current situation were advanced by some national resettlement agency representatives, particularly those who preferred using congregational models of sponsorship (which are not easily adaptable to the large volumes of refugee arrivals commonly associated with FASP). Yet even those resettlement agencies which are less than enthusiastic about participating in new FASP projects wholeheartedly supported at least two of the FASP design features: (1) utilizing the potential of resettlement sites which offer good employment opportunities; and (2) coordinating resettlement efforts at both the national level (through advance planning involving ORR, the State Department, and ACVA) and the state and local levels (through advance planning involving states, resettlement agencies, service providers and voluntary groups).

A second objective for FASP which is related to national placement policy goals was to begin to develop a larger number of stable refugee communities which would ultimately result in a more decentralized geographic pattern of refugee populations. One way in which the FASP demonstration appears to have furthered this objective (albeit on a small scale) has been to maintain and develop stable ethnic communities of refugees in alternate sites. Over the long run, these alternate sites are likely to become magnets for additional refugees, either those already residing in the U.S., or those who will enter as family reunification cases related to the 1983 wave of FASP refugees. In North Carolina, a large family reunification flow generated by FASP is expected during the coming year: 480 individuals are expected in family reunification cases during 1984. This has raised the issue of how to maintain the local resettlement and social service capacity to accommodate these new arrivals. In Arizona, although nearly every FASP case has close relatives still in Vietnam, the reunification process will take much longer, because of the delays involved in the Orderly Departure Program processing.

## FOOTNOTES

[1] Draft of an unpublished study conducted for ORR, which examined the post-resettlement outcomes for a sample of refugee arrivals in five sites: Cook County (Chicago), Illinois; King County (Seattle), Washington; Orange County, California; Harris County (Houston), Texas; and Suffolk County (Boston), Massachusetts. Ethnic groups included in the study were lowland Lao, Vietnamese, and Sino-Vietnamese.

[2] Paper prepared for presentation at Wingspread Conference on Refugee Adaption and Integration in the Unites States, March 1984.

[3] The only exceptions were single-parent households where the adult needed to remain home to care for young children or instances where medical or psychological health problems created employment barriers.

[4] In both North Carolina and Arizona, full-time minimum-wage employment is sufficient to disqualify most households from receipt of ongoing welfare grants, except for households with large number of dependent children and only a single wage-earner.

[5] It is perhaps significant that the two sites with the lowest outmigration of FASP refugees (Tucson and Greensboro) also had slightly higher rates of welfare dependency at the end of the 12-month demonstration period. It seems possible that these sites succeeded in retaining even those households which had a hard time "making it" on minimum wage or low-wage employment, or who lacked an employable adult, whereas the two sites with higher rates of outmigration (Phoenix and Charlotte) "lost" these cases to other localities.

[6] In Greensboro, one-fourth of FASP families never received cash assistance, while in Charlotte, all FASP refugees received cash assistance for at least a brief interval.

[7] Susan Forbes, Refugee Policy Group, in a paper delivered to the Wingspread Conference on Refugee Adaptation and Integration in the United Stated, March 1984.

[8] Geraldine Owens, personal communication.

[9] The size of this "critical mass" has been the topic of some discussion. Some agencies' experience would suggest that it takes a group of approximately 200 refugees to generate the resources needed to build sufficient staff capability, and that this number is also appropriate for building a stable, cohesive ethnic community. However a number of factors need to be taken into consideration:

- the number of refugees of the same ethnic group already living in the community;
- the extent to which the mainstream state-funded refugee social services are already available in the community; and

- whether resettlement and service responsibility is to be given to a single agency or shared among several agencies and service providers.

Thus, it appears that the appropriate size for a FASP project could be as small as 100 (with pre-existing refugees and social service capabilities) or a great deal larger (with shared resettlement and service responsibility). Other decisive factors might be the extent of the local community's receptivity to newly-arriving refugees and the availability of jobs and housing.

# APPENDIX A:

## List of Respondents, Arizona

## LIST OF RESPONDENTS: STATE OF ARIZONA REFUGEE PROGRAM, ARIZONA DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC SECURITY

Regina Murphy-Darling, State Refugee Coordinator

John Hausmann, Administrative Assistant to State Refugee Coordinator

Luba Chliwniak, Program Specialist, Refugee Program

Gene Hanson, MIS Specialist, Block Grants Division, Arizona Department of Economic Security

Guy Mikkelsen, Program Administrator, Block Grants Administration, Arizona Department of Economic Security

# LIST OF RESPONDENTS: TUCSON SITE

## Catholic Community Services, Tucson

Cathy Keane, Administrator, Resettlement Program

Chuck Mull, Resettlement Director

Bao Ngoc Nguyen, Resettlement Program Caseworker

Cong Truong, Resettlement Program Caseworker

Thach Chu, Caseworker, Refugee Assistance Program (Currently Supervisor, Refugee Job Service, Northside Job Service Job

Kiem Thi Truong, Caseworker, Refugee Assistance Program

Tri Tien Phan, Resettlement Worker and RAP caseworker

Gail Gibbons, Case Manager

## Lutheran Immigration and Refugee Services

Evie Trone, Campus Christian Center

## Other Service Providers

John Trilling, Refugee Education Project, Pima County Adult Education

Thanh Van Vo, Refugee Education Project, Pima County Adult Education

Tai Nguyen, Tucson Refugee Consortium

Chieu Dang, Northside Job Service Office

## FASP Refugees (names in Vietnamese form)

Ta Van Lai

Le Thi Hoa

Nguyen Thi Hoa

Dao Thi Nhuan

Tran Minh Quan

Pham Van Nhi

Tran Anh Tuan

Nguyen Thi Hien

Le Duy Hoi

Phuong Van Kinh

Tram Van Toan

Pham Minh Triet

Luong Van Hung

Vo Van Long

Lu Cuong Loi

## Sponsors of FASP Refugees

Don Klein

Pat and Fred Klein

Evy and Pat McNamara

Francesca Madonia

Janne Hart

Pat Dell

Alison Jameson

# LIST OF RESPONDENTS: PHOENIX SITE

## Catholic Social Services

Sister Maureen Webster, Coordinator, Refugee Program

Mary Jo Irelan, Resettlement Caseworker

Christine Gautama, Resettlement Caseworker

Loi Quach, Social Adjustment Worker, Refugee Assistance Program

Thac Nguyen, Social Adjustment Worker, Refugee Assistance Program

## Lutheran Social Ministry

Ed Naylor, Director, Refugee Program

Hilda Ngon, Resettlement Caseworker

Sarah Naylor, Director, Job Mart (Employment Project operated by Lutheran Social Ministry)

## Tolstoy Foundation

Daryl Kinney, Director, Resettlement Program

Ai Tang, Resettlement Caseworker

Van Abbel, Resettlement Caseworker

## World Relief Resettlement

Huy Phan, Resettlement Caseworker

John Parsons, World Relief Regional Director

Debbie Mitchell, Case Manager

## Other Service Providers

Chea Ng, Cambodian Association of Arizona

Ray Herrera, Lan Wheeler, Linh Nickels, Paul Kmon, Job Service

Linda Bacon, Nancy Meyers, Link V'FoRSS (ESL Program)

Other Community Actors

Tao Nguyen, Vietnam Veterans Association

Refugees (Names in Vietnamese Form)

Nguyen Dinh Xanh

Vu Thi Tho

Nguyen Ngoc Diep

Huynh To Ha and Huynh Ha

Ngo Van Nhung

Ngo Viet Oai

Lu Cuong Loi

Tran Van Diem

Truong Van Xuan

Nguyen Van Tien

# APPENDIX B:

## List of Respondents, North Carolina

# LIST OF RESPONDENTS: CHARLOTTE SITE

## Catholic Social Services

Sister Frances Sheriden, Program Administrator

Barbara Bazluki, Administrtive Assistant

Rosalie Holzinger, Social Worker II (Case Manager)

Barbara Latimer, Social Worker II (Case Manager)

Cira Ponce, Social Worker I

Huong Nguyen Ly, Health Specialist

Say An Chheng, Health Aide

Thai Kry Tan, Translator/Drivers' Education Coordinator

Kry Por, Translator

Kuong Chea, Translator

Linda Weller, Phase I Worker

Sonia Hayden, Volunteer Coordinator

Carol Hassel, ESL Coordinator

Nan Walker, Tutor Trainer

Jay Reynolds, Coordinator (out-of-county)

## Others

Joanie Mills, Food Stamps Eligibility Worker

Mary Teeling, Division of Social Services

Kay Mitchell, Coordinator, Bilingual Education, Charlotte/ Mecklenburg Schools

## Refugees (Cambodian Order)

Lok Phay

Sen Ny

172

Chham Ya

Thy Yav

Ngear Si Noeun

Ngear Kim

Tith Phaly

Sem Vorn

Khieu Proeun

Heak Sreu

Neang Nath

Sar Chanyan

## LIST OF RESPONDENTS: GREENSBORO SITE

### Lutheran Family Services

Virginia Soberg-Rhyne, LIRS Regional Consultant (Director)

Kathleen Quinby, FASP Coordinator

Celia Shankle, Housing/Home Management Specialist

Ben Matkins, Employment Specialist

Janet Berry, Health Specialist (CSS staff)

Ohm Sokum, Interpreter/Caseworker

Becky Shore, Volunteer Coordinator (LIRS)

Lisa Airoldi, ESL Instructor

### Others

Marti Outlaw, ESL Instructor, Cone Elementary School

Fran Hayes, Guilford County Health Department

Charles Zimmerman, Pastor, First Lutheran Church

Dr. Mesenbrink, Principal, Smith High School

Bill Issler, ESL Instructor, Smith High School

Ron Oberoi, Adult ESL Instructor (and Volunteer)

Ken Cox, Owner/Presient, Savoy Leather

Sherri Kelly, Volunteer

Ann Martin, Volunteer

Diane Gatlin, Plant Manager, Hag USA

### Refugees

Khiev Yo

Khon Phim

Khat Khorn

Ouk Rem

Ley Bunthan

Keo Sokan

Yann Kunthea

Sokha Mao

Dy Sary

Soeung Phou

Long Sothear

Long Sopeap

An Heng

Oeun Mann

Tuy Suong

## OTHER RESPONDENTS

Bob Edmundson, State Refugee Coordinator

Austin Connors, Governor's Office

Lillian Fountain, Church World Service, Charlotte

(Other members of Refugee Resettlement Committee, North Carolina Council of Churches)

Suanne Brooks, Director, ORR Region IV

The Venerable Maha Ghosananda

# APPENDIX C:

## Detailed Description of Local Refugee Resettlement Actors and Responsibilities in Phoenix and Tucson

# DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ACTORS AND RESPONSIBILITIES IN PHOENIX AND TUCSON

## PHOENIX REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ACTORS

Catholic Social Services has operated a refugee resettlement program as the USCC affiliate in Phoenix since 1975. At various times over this period, the agency has also operated ongoing social service programs for refugees, including mental health networking, social adjustment services, and job development services. At the present time, Catholic Social Services' Refugee Program staff are divided about evenly between the agency's State Department-funded reception and placement activities where staff include a Resettlement Director, two full-time resettlement caseworkers, a volunteer coordinator, and a part-time resettlement caseworker, (who works with the agency's Polish program) and the refugee assistance program (RAP), which has four social adjustment workers who do ongoing casework with all refugees in the local area, not just USCC clients. A half-time state-funded case manager (the same individual who is the part-time Polish caseworker) is responsible for submitting all required paperwork to the state.

The agency represents a combination of "congregational" and "agency" styles of sponsorship, since a number of refugee new arrivals are given a congregational sponsor, but all newly arriving refugees are also assigned to a resettlement caseworker, who holds the financial pursestrings for the R & P grant funds. The current situation represents an effort to encourage congregational participation by emphasizing a broad range of volunteer roles ranging from full sponsorship to donations of furniture or transportation to medical appointments.

Two resettlement caseworkers have been assigned to work with the FASP refugees. The same caseworkers are also responsible for all other Southeast Asian refugee arrivals. One caseworker is Vietnamese; the other is an American who has worked with USCC's refugee program for four and one-half years. In order to facilitate the provision of social services to USCC refugees, a number of refugees have been placed in housing close to the USCC Office in the northern area of Phoenix. Contact between the USCC resettlement workers and new refugee arrivals continues via follow-up contacts for a full 12-month period. Initially, this contact occurs at least once a week (more if no sponsor is involved); after employment is obtained, contacts are made at least once a month to stay in touch. Cases which appear to need a lot of ongoing help are referred to the BAP social adjustment caseworkers for their assistance. During the FASP demonstraion, Catholic Social Services resettled 129 FASP clients in a total of 69 cases.

Lutheran Social Ministry, the Phoenix LIRS affiliate, also started resettling refugees in the Phoenix area in 1975, though it has always resettled smaller volumes than Catholic Social Services. Lutheran Social Ministry follows a congregational sponsorship model, and thus maintains a smaller in-house staff, which includes a Resettlement Director (an American) and a half-time caseworker, who is Cambodian. A core group of a dozen Lutheran congregations statewide are the faithful standbys for sponsoring refugees, which have each sponsored multiple refugees over the years. For FASP, Lutheran Social Ministry has located some new sponsors as well as a number of repeat sponsors. During FASP, the agency resettled 41 FASP refugees, falling slightly short of their goal of 50 due to an inability to get more congregations to commit themselves to sponsorship.

While most of the other resettlement agencies participating in FASP utilize the job placement services available through the state refugee social service contract with Job Service, Lutheran Social Ministry follows a more "self-contained" service model, preferring to rely on congregational sponsors or their own in-house Job Mart program (operated by Lutheran Social Ministry, but not targeted specifically to refugees) to find employment for refugee clients.

Tolstoy Foundation began operations in Phoenix in February 1982. During its first year of refugee resettlement operations (prior to FASP,) the agency affiliate had resettled a total of 150 to 200 refugees, most of whom were Poles, other Europeans, and Afghans. Fewer than 50 Indochinese had been resettled by Tolstoy in Phoenix prior to FASP. Local agency staff at start of the FASP project included a Resettlement Director, a Vietnamese caseworker,a volunteer coordinator and a half-time Polish caseworker. Part-way through the demonstration the Polish caseworker left, and was replaced by another full-time Vietnamese caseworker to meet the needs of the FASP arrivals. In addition, the agency hired a part-time staff person to do paperwork in advance of refugee arrivals.

Like a number of the other resettlement agencies in Phoenix, Tolstoy Foundation decided to utilize a broad range of volunteers in its resettlement program, to offer assistance and social contacts to newly arriving refugees, rather than trying to get commitments for full sponsorship. Over fifteen volunteers have been active with the program during the FASP demonstration. So long as the Tolstoy Foundation had two bilingual resettlement caseworkers, they did not often need to call on the RAP workers at USCC for ongoing casework with their clients. By September 1983, however, the staff had been reduced to one bilingual worker, and they were facing the reality that they would probably need to start tapping into the RAP State-funded refugee social adjustment service. During FASP, Tolstoy Foundation resettled 121 FASP individuals, who comprised 70 separate cases. This constituted the entire volume of Vietnamese free cases assigned to Tolstoy Foundation nationally during the demonstration period.

World Relief and Refugee Services started operations in Phoenix in 1981 without a paid local staff under a congregational sponsorship model, with large amounts of time volunteered by the individual who ultimately became the paid Director of the World Relief Office. This office is currently located in a space donated by a church in Tempe, which is 15 miles east of Phoenix. Originally, World Relief began by resettling Cambodian refugees as part of Phoenix's Cambodian cluster project. Thus, in addition to resettling FASP refugees during 1983, the agency has also had some Cambodian family reunification cases. Throughout most of FASP, World Relief has operated with a Resettlement Director and a Vietnamese caseworker. The agency has relied on an active volunteer support community of Vietnamese and Americans to help find refugees jobs and to provide social contacts and other assistance. Beginning in September 1984, the Phoenix World Relief Office reverted back to a congregational sponsorship model, in order to avoid further "burnout" on the part of the agency staff. During the FASP demonstration, the agency resettled 83 FASP refugees. An unanticipated leave of absense by the local agency director during the FASP project contributed to the agency falling short of their commitment of resettling 125 individuals for FASP.

The DES Refugee Job Service has been in operation for three years, and was part of a conscious effort to create a comprehensive employment service program that would be available to clients of all resettlement agencies. Originally housed in the office of Catholic Social Services, the Job Service refugee program is now located in local Job Service field offices. During the FASP demonstration, the Phoenix program consisted of a Job Service supervisor (who reports both to the Director of that Job Service office and to the State Refugee Coordinator)[1] and three bilingual job developers (2 Vietnamese, 1 Laotian). Each job developer is assigned a particular caseload, with whom he or she works until the refugees are employed or until the program loses contact with the client. Employers who are contacted by the job developers frequently hire more than one refugee over time. Thirty, sixty, and ninety day contacts with employers are used to follow-up once job placements are made.

In order to adjust to the expected service demands of the FASP caseload, the Phoenix Job Service program added a new position (the second Vietnamese job developer) and, partway through the year, assigned one of the job developers to be outstationed in a Job Service office in near Tempe, in order to be able to service the FASP arrivals resettled by World Relief.[2]

Link Volunteers For Refugee Self-Sufficiency (Link V'FoRSS), the refugee ESL program, suffered a budget crisis in the middle of the FASP program year, which has forced its staff to be reduced from three full-time professional ESL teachers, each of whom supervised from four to ten volunteer teachers, to a more limited paid professional staff and a more focused volunteer program. Currently, part-time paid ESL teachers, together with 13-15 volunteers (who are teaching ESL as part of their graduate program in Intercultural Community Studies at Arizona State University) provide ESL classes at six different sites in both Phoenix and Tempe. Each site offers classes two nights per week. One site also offers day-time classes two days per week.

The Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) in Phoenix is operated through a state-funded social service contract with Catholic Social Services. As part of this contract, four social adjustment workers are available to meet the ongoing social service needs of all refugees in the Phoenix area. Two of the RAP workers, both of whom are Vietnamese, (but one of whom also speaks Chinese) are assigned to work with Southeast Asian refugees. These staff visit refugees mostly in their homes.[9] Two days each week, a RAP worker is outstationed in Tempe, in order to be accessible to World Relief cases. The types of problems with which the RAP workers assist refugees include everything from child abuse problems to assistance with, access to, and interpretation for medical services. By January of 1984, the number of RAP staff available to serve Vietnamese cases had been reduced to one caseworker, and on-site office hours in Tempe had been deleted.

The Cambodian Association of Arizona was contracted by the State of Arizona (funded partly with an ORR national grant to strengthen the capacity of MAAs as service providers and partly with state funds) to provide "work adjustment" training to all new arrivals in Phoenix between February 1, 1983 and December 31, 1983. Ironically, the composition of refugee arrivals throughout this period was predominantly Vietnamese. In order to provide this service to FASP refugees, the Cambodian Association hired a Vietnamese instructor. The 20-hour training session, which is taught in the refugees' native language, covers job interview techniques, information about the local job market, and other information on obtaining a job for the first time as well as job upgrading techniques.

Finally, Phoenix also has a variety of informal Vietnamese Associations, none of which are currently formally incorporated, but which do play an important role in the social and cultural life in the Vietnamese community. Among these associations are the Vietnamese Friendship Association, an association of Vietnamese Catholics, an association of Vietnamese Buddhists, and the Vietnamese Veterans Association, which is open to any man who fought in the military during the Vietnam war. A Vietnamese Women's Association is currently in the process of forming, and during the September site visit, they sponsored an all-day Vietnamese Mid-Autumn Festival, which was very well attended by the Vietnamese community. Interest is starting to crystallize around the idea of developing a Vietnamese cultural and activity center in Phoenix. Beginning in 1984 a Vietnamese Mutual Assistance Association became the recipient of the state contract to provide work orientation training.

## TUCSON REFUGEE RESETTLEMENT ACTORS

Catholic Community Services (CCS) in Tucson opened its doors as a refugee resettlement program in 1975. Originally following a more standard congregational mode of resettlement, the agency has devoted substantial energy during the past three years to developing interest among families throughout all strata of the Tucson Community in "sponsoring" CCS refugees. Though the sponsorship arrangements designed by CCS do not include financial responsibility for the new arrivals, they are designed as a serious (and on occasion humor-filled) commitment on the part of the sponsors to work (and play) with their refugees to help them make a good life for themselves in Tucson.

The paid resettlement agency staff includes a Program Administrator, a Refugee Program Director, and two resettlement caseworkers who work with Southeast Asian refugees. The FASP caseload of 210 arrivals during 1983 constituted roughly 65% of Catholic Community Services' total caseload during the year. Other refugee arrivals during 1983 include family reunification cases, Orderly Departure (ODP) case, from

Vietnam, seven free cases who have not been part of the FASP program, and a number of non-Southeast Asian refugees, ranging from Ethiopian to Polish. CCS' resettlement caseworkers generally work with their clients for up to 90 days before "closing the case." After this point, although the resettlement caseworker will still get involved, if necessary, the case is transferred to the RAP program worker, who tends to work with "problem cases" on an ongoing basis.

The Refugee Education Project operates the Tucson ESL program for all refugees, under a state social service contract. Part-time ESL teachers offer ESL classes in two different locations (a third location was also available during the first part of the FASP period). Morning classes are offered in the basic English needed to get through a job interview; afternoon classes are offered for students at all levels, in order to accomodate a number of refugees who work swing shift; while evening classes are offered at two distinct levels -- beginning and advanced.

The Refugee Education Project also operates a vocational training program, which develops training positions with employers, offers employers a partial subsidy (averaging $250 per training slot) for a training period lasting up to a month, and matches refugees' skills and interests to the available training positions.

The Refugee Assistance Program (RAP), like its counterpart in Phoenix, is operated by Catholic Community Services, but is available to all refugees in the Tucson area. Although there is substantial flexibility in the work load distribution between the RAP workers and the CCS resettlement caseworkers, in general the RAP workers will open a case file in order to serve refugees who have already been in the U.S. 90 days. The most common concerns with which the RAP staff assist refugees include health problems, and the need for health interpretors. By six months or one year after arrival, the cases who still need help are a smaller number of "problem" cases.

The Refugee Job Service placement program in Tucson is located about five blocks from the CCS Refugee Center. The refugee program staff during 1983 consisted of a Job Service supervisor, a Laotian job developer, and a Vietnamese job developer. The Vietnamese job developer has been very busy since the FASP project started, since they didn't expect that so many of the 210 FASP arrivals in Tucson would be single heads of households in need of assistance in finding a job. By January of 1984, the Job Service supervisor position had been refilled by a bilingual individual with previous experience as a RAP caseworker, thus expanding the staff available to provide direct services to FASP clients as well as other Vietnamese refugee clients.

The Tucson Refugee Consortium is also housed in the same building as Catholic Community Services and the Refugee Education Project. The part-time paid staff person for the consortium is a former USCC caseworker with two years resettlement casework experience. He oversees a staff of four part-time instructors who teach work orientation classes in Vietnamese, Laotian, and Cambodian. In addition, during 1983, the Refugee Consortium helped sponsor and provide prevocational training to refugees interested in entering the electronics field.

## APPENDIX C FOOTNOTES

[1] Since the State Job Service and the State Refugee Office are both part of the Arizona Department of Economic Security, the State Coordinator has been designated as the functional supervisor for these job service staff.

[2] By the tme of the September site visit, this was not yet considered a workable arrangement, since the World Relief refugees were not coming into the Mesa Job Service office and consequently this staff member was being under-utilized. Subsequently, the staff member was reassigned to the Phoenix Job Service office.

[3] Few recent refugees in Arizona have telephones in their homes, because the installation charge and deposit are very expensive (approximately $185).

# APPENDIX D:

## Description of Local Actors and Responsibilities: North Carolina

## DESCRIPTION OF LOCAL ACTORS AND RESPONSIBILITIES: NORTH CAROLINA

### Description of the Major Actors in Charlotte

Catholic Social Services (CSS), the USCC affiliate in Charlotte, has resettled over 2,000 refugees in Western North Carolina between 1975 and 1983. Most of their refugees are resettled within the Charlotte metropolitan area, using a "church/agency" model of resettlement. The refugees resettled in the remainder of the 46-county area which comprises the Diocese of Charlotte are required to have individual sponsors and/or relatives who will take responsibility for them. Staff in the Charlotte office include Phase I (USCC-funded reception and placement) staff and Refugee Assistance Program (RAP) staff. RAP is the refugee social services contract with the state, which has been in effect since July of 1980. Under the RAP contract, CSS served over 1,000 refugees between August 1982 and July 1983, most of whom were in Mecklenburg County (the Charlotte metropolitan area).

In late 1981 and early 1982, CSS undertook the resettlement of approximately 100 Cambodian refugees. The agency's success in helping these refugees obtain self-sufficiency, and the ongoing close relationships between these Cambodians and "their sponsor" (as refugees often refer to CSS staff) meant that CSS undertook FASP resettlement with enthusiasm and with the knowledge that the existing Cambodian residents were available to assist them as volunteers.

CSS originally agreed to resettle 300 FASP refugees in the Charlotte area. The actual number of Cambodian refugees resettled through July 31, 1983 was 342 (of which 304 were FASP and the remaining 38 were family reunification cases), with a few cases arriving after that date. These included some relatives of the original FASP group and the previously-resettled Cambodians who were accepted as family reunification cases. During the latter part of 1983, additional Cambodian family reunification cases are being resettled.

In Charlotte, staff of Catholic Social Services (the USCC affiliate and sole resettlement agency with responsibility for FASP refugees) include the following:

- Refugee Program Administrator;
- Administrative Assistant;
- Phase I Worker (USCC)
- "Limited Service" worker;
- Employment Specialist;
- Driver Education Coordinator;
- ESL Coordinator;
- ESL Tutor Trainer;
- Medical Translator;
- Health Specialist
- Volunteer Coordinator (USCC);
- Two Case Managers;
- Three Cambodian Interpreters/Case Aides; and
- Other staff responsible for resettlement and services outside of Mecklenberg County.

CSS staff is relatively stable; most were on board prior to FASP. The major change in their activities has to do with working with this particular population of refugees, who have a greater cultural adjustment to make than any prior group of refugees have had. The Administrative Assistant, who is part of the overall management team headed by the Program Administrator, also had the direct case management responsibility for the earlier Cambodian group and is one of the agency's primary links to utilizing these earlier arrivals as volunteers.

The Phase I worker is responsible for initial reception and housing for new arrivals. She works with the Volunteer Coordinator to make sure that the initial needs of new arrivals (furnishing, household items, clothing, food, etc.) are met. The two case managers each have a caseload of 150-175 refugees, principally FASP refugees. Their backgrounds are in psychiatric social work and wide-ranging social services for disadvantaged persons. They and their interpretors are responsible for day-to-day contact and problem-solving with refugees and for coordinating other social services individually for each refugee family. The employment specialist position was in transition during the time of the BPA site visit, as the long-standing person in that role had decided to pursue post-graduate studies. The Medical Translator and one of the interpreters (who was also beginning to assume some employment responsibilities along with coordinating the driver training program) are a husband-wife team of Cambodians. Catholic Social Services RAP staff directly provide employment (pre-employment, job development, and follow-up) services. They also coordinate driver training (actually provided through a subcontract) and health services. Staff also provide home management, social adjustment, ESL (using both staff and volunteer tutors) and transportation services.

Funding for the staff providing these services is a combination of CSS's ongoing Refugee (RAP) contract with the North Carolina Department of Human Resources and the FASP social services allocation in addition to the USCC funding for initial resettlement. There is a clear separation in functions between Phase I (initial resettlement) and RAP service activities, though the daily activities of individual staff persons may sometimes combine these two types of functions.

One impressive feature of the CSS system is the way in which they have organized volunteer activities, which are largely related to initial resettlement and are coordinated by a USCC-funded staff person. Several Catholic churches in the area have been identified as willing to undertake voluntary responsibilities. Each parish is assigned a specific area of responsibility, such as collecting and sorting donated clothing, collecting donated furniture, accompanying newly-arrived refugee families to the "warehouse" to select and try on clothing, accompanying newly-arrived families to the grocery store for the first time, setting up apartments prior to the arrival of each new family, etc. Each parish has a coordinator of volunteer activities, who receives a stipend or part-time pay. That person is responsible for maintaining a list of volunteers within the parish and notifying each volunteer of his or her responsibilities. In most of these parishes, a different person or family is "on call" during each week of the year so that responsibilities rotate among volunteers. Those volunteers engaged in activities which involve contact with refugee families often become friends with the families and continue the relationship beyond the week to which they were "assigned." This system of organizing volunteer efforts appears to have been very successful, largely because it is well organized and allows for a limited or flexible contribution of time from a large number of persons.

One especially strong area of volunteer involvement in Charlotte is in ESL tutoring for those refugees who cannot leave their homes to participate in classes. Volunteers are asked to commit themselves to six weeks of ESL tutoring to a specific refugee family. A written curriculum is given to each volunteer along with tutor training, and the volunteer is able to observe the first of the six lessons, given by the ESL coordinator, as a further orientation. Many tutors sign up for several six-week "tours of duty."

One aspect of the Charlotte project which was particularly emphasized by the Administrator is the shared responsibility for outcomes. Though different staff persons have defined areas of responsibility, they all act as case managers when appropriate. Communication among staff is frequent; the designated case manger for each refugee family is kept informed of situations that may require her attention, but all staff are available to help individual refugees as needed.

Additional agencies in Charlotte which are instrumental in working with refugees are (1) the Division of Social Services (county welfare office) which has designated a contact person for CSS who facilitates the processing of refugee applications for assistance, (2) the Food Stamps office, which has a parallel arrangement, (3) the County Health Department, where initial health screenings take place, (4) the Bilingual Education Program in the Mecklenburg School District, which has developed a comprehensive multinational ESL program, orientation materials in several Indochinese languages, including Khmer, and a comprehensive program of working with limited-English students in all schools which maximizes their contact with the "mainstream" teacher and classmates while providing individualized ESL on a daily basis. This program has been the recipient of several special grants which have allowed for development of related programs, such as a prevocational curriculum for high school students, (5) Central Piedmont Community College, the traditional provider of ESL to adults (though budget cutbacks forced them to curtail services during the first half of 1983), and the YWCA, which provided ESL during the time that the community college course was unavailable.

## Description of the Major Actors in Greensboro

Lutheran Family Services (LFS), the LIRS affiliate in Greensboro, has been in existence since 1979. Until 1982, this office, like many LIRS affiliates, adhered strictly to the congregational model of sponsorship. After ongoing discussions with the local congregations that had been most active in providing sponsorships, the agency shifted, during 1982, to a church/agency program. The shift took place primarily because congregations had become reluctant to take on the full responsibility of sponsorship, which has become increasingly demanding over the past four years as newly arriving groups of refugees need more and more services. Churches provide many donated goods, clothing, and furniture needed for initial resettlement; they also provide volunteer tutors, assist refugees with transportation and shopping, and develop friendships with individual families that contribute to the emotional and cultural adjustment of the new arrivals. The agency takes responsibility for employment, housing, transportation, and other social services. Until the beginning of the FASP project, these services could be delivered only to the extent that LIRS funding would allow, since LFS did not have a RAP contract with the state. LFS did have the statewide Unaccompanied Minors contract, and so the State Coordinator was aware of the resettlement and service capabilities of the agency. The initial FASP commitment was for 200 persons. All but two families had arrived as of mid-September 1983. One of those families was designated as FASP, but will be joining FASP relatives already in Greensboro. The other family was delayed in the processing center because of a medical hold. The final FASP count is expected to be 216 refugees.

Project staff in Greensboro consists of the following persons:

- Project Coordinator;
- Housing/Home Management Specialist;
- Employment Specialist;
- Health Specialist (this is actually a CSS Charlotte staff

person on loan to the LFS project);

- one Cambodian Interpreter; and
- an Administrative Assistant.

The Project Coordinator who was recruited especially for the FASP project, has a refugee program background in the context of both overseas ESL and orientation and domestic resettlement programs. The Cambodian interpreter was also new to both LFS and to Charlotte. The housing/home management specialist was the sole LFS staff person, other than the overall LFS Director (an LIRS Regional Consultant) and the Unaccompanied Minors caseworker, during 1982. This was the first year in which the agency took on the major part of the sponsorship responsibility. The health specialist is a Catholic Social Services (Charlotte Refugee Office) staff person on loan to the Greensboro project. The Administrative Assistant was initially hired part-time but later became full-time. She takes responsibility for recordkeeping and consolidating the individual service reports from all staff to be submitted monthly to the North Carolina Department of Human Resources/State Refugee Coordinator.

One additional (part-time) staff person is funded by LIRS but works a great deal with FASP refugees; the Volunteer Coordinator was hired a few months before the end of the FASP year, after serving as a volunteer. She is responsible for recruiting and staying in touch with congregational and individual volunteers. LFS also benefits from a university student internship program, which has provided "volunteer" assistance throughout the FASP year. The Employment Specialist was hired several weeks after the beginning of the FASP project, after a change in the initial plans which called for an outside CETA contract for delivering employment services.

FASP project staff persons all act as case managers. In many contexts, these staff persons' functions are interchangeable. All are involved in directly delivering home management and cultural orientation services to refugees in informal situations. All deliver transportation services to refugees when needed. However, there is specialization when possible. In particular, employment and health services tend to be the exclusive responsibility of the respective specialists in those areas.

Other actors in the community with refugee involvement, very much parallel to agencies' participation in Charlotte's service program, are:

- the health clinic and the local hospitals. They have been extremely cooperative, attempting to train their own staffs to serve the Cambodian group more effectively.
- the ESL instructors in the schools. Greensboro has two "magnet" elementary schools to which all non-English-speaking children are directed. The children's school day is split between ESL and their regular classrooms. A local high school has also provided ESL to its Cambodian students. The local community college at first served Cambodian refugees in their regular classes. This initial arrangement was less than ideal. The instruction was geared to increasing reading and writing skills, rather than focusing on the survival-oriented spoken English skills most needed by the FASP group. After the end of the FASP year, LFS facilitated an alternate arrangement ofr ESL which has been welcomed enthusiastically by the FASP refugees. LFS recruited an ESL instructor (who had worked with FASP teenagers during the summer of 1983), arranged for donated classroom space in a local church (along with a van for transporting refugees to and from classes); and persuaded the community college to hire the ESL instructor to provide two separate ESL classes on an ongoing basis. The daytime class meets three times per week for three hours; the night class meets five nights per week for two hours. Each class has nearly twenty students, though enrollment is informal. Both classes are well-attended and make good use of American volunteer assistants for individualized instruction and informal group discussion.
- a one- time orientation and ESL program which was conducted over the summer of 1983 for high-school-age students; and
- the Employment Security (Job Service) office; and the welfare and Food Stamps offices.

# APPENDIX E:

## Case Profiles of FASP Refugees in Arizona

These case profiles represent refugee cases resettled by all the resettlement agencies which participated in FASP in Tucson and Phoenix. In order to protect client confidentiality, client resettlement agency, and city identifiers have been removed.

Case 1 consists of a single male aged 20 who arrived in Arizona on March 1, 1983. His family was still in Vietnam, but he had an American friend -- a Catholic priest in Portland, Oregon, whom he had known in Vietnam, and who had sponsored some other young Vietnamese refugees. Although his biodata said that he was willing to be resettled anywhere, as soon as this young man arrived in Arizona, he said that he wanted to go to Oregon. After telephone calls to the priest to confirm that he would take responsibility for assisting the refugee once he got to Portland, the resettlement agency agreed to help him move to Oregon. They did this with the conviction that the youth would be better off with his friend in Oregon taking care of him than he would be in Arizona.

On March 21, 20 days after arrival in the U.S., he left for Oregon. Information which has trickled back since that time indicates that the youth is on welfare and is going to school in Oregon.

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency in Arizona has had no contact with this youth since he left the state.

Case 2 consists of a 44 year old single man who had been a commander of special forces in Vietnam prior to 1975. This previous experience makes him somewhat of a hero to other refugees. Although his English comprehension is excellent, his previous experience is not directly transferrable to employment opportunities in Arizona.

Finally, through the assistance of the president of the local Vietnamese Association, the refugee obtained a job at the sofa factory, but he reportedly felt that this job was beneath him. When a friend from Texas sent him a plane ticket to come to Texas, and said that he could find a better job for him in an aircraft factory, he moved to Texas. This happened in September, a few days before the site visit.

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency in Arizona has no new news of this case.

Case 3 consists of a 24 year old single woman, her 16 year old brother, and her eight year old nephew. The "principal applicant" had no work history prior to coming to the U.S. Her English on arrival was poor, according to the case worker. She had completed the sixth grade in Vietnam.

Less than one month after arrival, the 24 year old got a full-time job at a manufacturing plant paying minimum wage. The job was located for her by the Refugee Job Service. Once she started working, the household moved so that she would be closer to her job. The refugee attends ESL classes in the afternoon before going to work at 3:30 p.m.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still working night shift at the same manufacturing job. Her brother is attending high school, and working half-time as a dishwasher. The head of this household is no longer attending ESL classes, since she often works overtime. She receives AFDC grants for her two dependents (her nephew and her brother) but was determined not to be on welfare herself. She has not yet purchased a car, as she is afraid to drive.

Case 4 consists of a 31 year old female and her four children, one of whom was born after she arrived in Arizona. The other children are ages seven, eight, and ten. The head of this household, which arrived in Arizona on April 20, 1983, is a widow whose husband was missing in action in the war in Vietnam. She has a boyfriend from Vietnam who was in the same refugee camp with her and is the father of her youngest child. He was resettled in Texas, but has migrated to Arizona to join her.

Because she has a newborn baby, the household head is not currently working outside the home. She is, however, babysitting two children of another FASP couple who are both working full time. (These children, who are three or four years old, were starting to invent their own language to communicate with each other, and were refusing to speak either Vietnamese or English. Now that they are receiving more attention, they are beginning to speak Vietnamese.) She does plan to begin working a job on the night shift after her baby is six months old.

The older children in this family are attending school.

The boyfriend/fiance is currently living with the family and is helping to support them. The resettlement agency helped him to get a job with an electronics company at $4.30 per hour. He was a fighter pilot before 1975 in Vietnam. He has been able to purchase a car. The family is still receiving Food Stamps.

The resettlement agency would be "happier" if there had been a wedding day set for the refugee and her fiance. So far, no mention has been made of an actual marriage.

Update as of February, 1984: Since September, 1983 the household head got a "home industry" job, with the assistance of the resettlement agency, doing piecework in her home hand-packing various products for sale.

In October, however, all the members of this household decided to move to California. According to resettlement agency staff, the head of household went to California one month ahead of time and applied for welfare, then returned to Arizona during the one-month "waiting period" and finally moved to California on October 22, 1984. The household head's fiance quit his job in order to move to Californa with the family.

Case 5 consists of a 21 year old single man who arrived in Arizona on January 13, 1983. This refugee had completed eight years of schooling in Vietnam. Prior to 1975, he was a student; after 1975, he was a rice farmer. Within the first week after arrival, the refugee registered with the refugee project at the Job Service office to obtain a job. However, within several weeks, he started talking about moving to Georgia to join his uncle who lived in Marietta. His sponsors, an older couple who have sponsored a number of refugees, say that he was under pressure from both his mother (in Vietnam) and his uncle to move to Georgia. After sending a letter to his uncle, and receiving a reply stating that he would like his nephew to join him, the resettlement agency took him to the bus station and helped him buy his ticket. On February 24, 1983, the refugee left Arizona.

The uncle in Georgia had not been listed on the youth's biodata, where he stated that he was willing to be resettled anywhere in the U.S.

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency staff report that this refugee is still living in Georgia where he is working at two different jobs. He has applied to bring his relatives from Vietnam to the U.S.

Case 6 consists of a young married ethnic Chinese couple with no children, who married while they were in the refugee camp. Both husband and wife are 24 years old. The husband had five years' work experience in Vietnam as a meatcutter and mechanic, while the wife worked as a dressmaker for five years before leaving Vietnam. Both family members had good English skills on arrival in the U.S. (The husband was rated at level "D" and the wife at level "E" by the refugee processing center.)

Upon arrival in Arizona on June 23, 1983, the family was provided by the resettlement agency with an apartment which they shared with another couple. Within two weeks, the husband had obtained a job on his own, working in an oriental food market at minimum wage. The wife secured a job at the beginning of August (five weeks after arrival) with the assistance of the Refugee Job Service. Her job is with a local sewing company which has hired a number of refugees, at $3.80 per hour. After obtaining employment, the family moved on their own to a neighborhood in which many Vietnamese refugees have clustered. They share their present apartment with two other "families" -- two single women and one single man.

When the family first arrived in Arizona, they said they would like to move to California, where there is a larger ethnic Chinese community. They had friends in California, and perhaps also distant relatives. The resettlement agency caseworkers encouraged the family to stay in Arizona, and the family appears to be happy with their situation now.

Although both husband and wife attended the joint FASP orientation provided by the resettlement agencies, neither one has chosen to attend ESL classes since arrival. (This may not be inappropriate, since they spoke English well upon arrival.) They are using English language tapes to study English on their own at home.

Both husband and wife still have close relatives overseas. The husband's family is in Saigon, while the wife's parents and siblings are in Hong Kong.

Since September, this couple decided to move to California to join an uncle, who said he would give them jobs. According to resettlement agency staff, at the time they moved they had good English skills and were emotionally, socially, and financially self-sufficient. Resettlement agency staff warned them that a distant relative in the refugee camps who was scheduled to join them in Arizona would not be allowed to be resettled in California, but they say they don't think the refugees believed this. The family has applied for welfare since arriving in California.

Case 7 consists of a 39 year old man whose wife and three children remained behind in Vietnam when he escaped. This refugee finished the eleventh grade in Vietnam and then served in the military. After 1975, he became a painter and tire recapper. After arriving in Arizona on June 22, 1983, he was placed in an apartment with a 19 year old FASP refugee, with whom he gets along very well.

After one week in the U.S., this refugee obtained a job at minimum wage as a night custodian working at a car dealership. At first, he did not get along well with his coworker, a black man; however, after his coworker quit, he got along fine with the new person. Although he is working hard at his job, the refugee would like very much to get a daytime job instead of a night shift job.

This refugee arrived in the U.S. with "fairly good English" and has been working hard practicing English with his sponsor. He is saving his money so that he will be able to sponsor his wife and family under the ODP program. He has been self-sufficient ever since obtaining his job the first week — he never even applied for Food Stamps. He has a good sense of humor, which was evident during a visit with the refugee and his sponsor.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still working at the same job. He is living with his sponsor's family where he is now "one of the family."

Case 8 consisted of two brothers, ages 32 and 20, who arrived in Arizona on February 21, 1983. Both brothers had had formal schooling in Vietnam; the older brother had worked as a rice farmer. They spoke very English very well when they arrived in the United States.

An individual sponsor had been arranged for this case by the resettlement agency. The brothers announced when they arrived that they wanted to start working right away; they didn't want to sign up for Food Stamps, until the agency explained that that wouldn't hurt as a temporary support.

Refugee Job Service found both brothers jobs about one month after their arrival, doing maintenance work at the same resort. The older brother worked day shift, while the younger brother worked night shift. Both jobs paid $3.50 per hour.

The two brothers had left most of their family behind in Vietnam. This included not only their mother and two siblings, but also the older brother's wife and seven children. They did have, however, one relative already in the United States -- an elderly aunt in Bellevue, Washington. This aunt had tried to sponsor them from the camps, but they had chosen to go elsewhere as free cases, in order to have more independence from this older relative. After they arrived in Arizona, the aunt began calling them and insisting that they move to Washington to be with her. At first, they didn't want to go. Finally, they gave in. The resettlement agency tried to dissuade them from moving. Both brothers wanted to go to college, and the agency staff advised them to stay in Arizona for one year so they could enter school at resident tuition levels. Agency staff also let them know that when the welfare office in Washington called to check on their history, they would have to let them know that they had quit jobs in Arizona, which would delay their ability to receive welfare. When it became clear that they couldn't be dissuaded, they gave the sponsor one month's warning, and gave the sponsor money to give them for gas for the trip. They finally moved to Washington in June 1983, four months after arrival in Arizona.

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency has had no further contact with this case.

Case 9 consists of a single woman, 24 years old, who arrived in Arizona on March 29, 1983. She is ethnic Chinese, and speaks Cantonese, but not much Vietnamese. This refugee had experience working as a cook in Vietnam. Resettlement agency staff say she may be slightly mentally retarded. At any rate, she appeared to have some difficulty getting along with the young woman with whom she shared an apartment, and with the other young people who would gather together to party at their apartment.

An incident occurred in which the young woman claims she was sexually assaulted by one of the visitors to the apartment. Medical examination did not substantiate her report. Whatever the truth of the incident, the refugee was fearful after this took place, and migrated briefly to California, where she had a relative (perhaps a cousin) who was not listed on the "biodata."

Upon her return to Arizona three weeks later, she found a job in a drugstore, and, after about a month living on her own, moved in with a Vietnamese family who had been in the U.S. since 1975. Her situation appears to be stable now.

Update as of February, 1984: Since September, this individual quit her job and tried a job working in a sewing factory. However, she didn't like this job and went back to her first job. She is doing well, is financially and socially independent, and will be joined next month by her two sisters from a refugee camp.

Case 10 consists of a 30 year old single man and his 20 year old niece who arrived in Arizona on August 4, 1983. Before leaving Vietnam, the man had been a student and had completed one year in college studying law, then been an air cadet in the military. After 1975, he spent three months in a reeducation camp and worked as a cook.

After arrival in Arizona, the niece entered the Job Corps. She returns home on weekends and stays with a family near her uncle and visits him. The uncle is living in an apartment with other single FASP men. On September 19, about six weeks after arrival, the refugee obtained ajob at a bagel bakery where one of his friends also works. This job was negotiated as a training position, with the Refugee Education Project subsidizing part of the salary during a brief training period.

Update as of February, 1984: Resettlement agency staff report that this refugee is now self-reliant. He was laid off from his bakery job, but obtained another job at an electronics assembly plan. He is sharing an apartment with two friends. The niece is still enrolled in Job Corps.

Case 11 represents a success story, according to resettlement agency workers. The case consists of a family of six people who arrived in Arizona in May 1983. The family includes a 32 year old man, his wife, their two children aged four and two, and the man's two brothers aged 17 and 18. The head of household was a television repairman in Vietnam.

The first job obtained by the head of household, within two months after arrival, was a job in a warehouse paying $3.35 per hour, which was obtained for him by Job Service. He found himself another job working for an electronics firm paying $4.50 per hour several weeks later. The wife is currently working two part-time jobs. The first job is a 15-hour per week job for a sewing company at $3.50 per hour. The second job is doing alterations for a dry cleaning shop ten to 15 hours per week.

The 18 year old brother has wanted to enroll in Job Corps, and was called in September to let him know that he can enter the Job Corps. The 17 year old brother is enrolled in high school.

The family is continuing to improve their language skills. The head of household already has excellent English skills. The wife and one of her brothers-in-law ride bikes three miles two evenings a week to attend ESL classes.

This family is saving money with the hopes of ultimately being able to buy their own home in Arizona. They have already purchased a car, which they financed partly through loans from friends. They would also like to be able to help relatives who are still in Vietnam or in refugee camps. Except for a small amount of Food Stamps, they are already financially self-sufficient.

The family is not interested in moving to California, as they have heard that it is "too crowded" there. There is a prospect for secondary migration in the other direction, since the head of household has a brother in San Jose who is planning to move to Arizona.

Update as of February, 1984: The wife in this family now has a full-time job working night shift in a knitting factory. Since her husband works day shift, they are able to take care of their two young children without outside care. The husband is now making $5.00 per hour at his job. He regularly works 16 hours of overtime each week (by working seven days per week).

The uncle in San Jose decided not to move to Arizona since the rest of his family in California was not interested in moving with him.

Case 12 consists of a single male, 25 years of age, who arrived in Arizona on March 17, 1983. His parents, brothers, and sisters remain in Vietnam. Shortly under one month after arriving, he migrated to Cleveland, Ohio, to join a friend who had come to the U.S. as a refugee in 1975. After talking to the friend by telephone, the caseworker was convinced that his friend would be able to take better care of him than the agency would and that it would be better for him to go.

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency staff have had no contact with this client since he left Arizona.

Case 13 consists of a 31 year old woman, her ten year old son, her five year old daughter, and her husband's brother, who is 26 years old. They arrived in Arizona on May 7, 1983. The head of household's husband is still in Vietnam. The head of household had worked as a tailor in Vietnam, while the brother-in-law had worked as a vendor.

The brother-in-law was the first family member to obtain employment in a sewing factory, one month after arrival. He is not very happy with the job. The head of household got a job after about three months. Before she finally found her job, the sponsor wanted to assist her in signing up for welfare, because the brother-in-law was not sharing his money with the family completely. He was willing to pay only half the rent, since if he paid the rent and electric bill, that would take his entire paycheck. The resettlement agency staff instead arranged to loan money to the head of household that she will be able to pay back, and arranged for her to receive emergency utility assistance funds from another source.

The members of this household visited California with another family, but decided to return to Arizona because the woman realizes that she will be eligible for family reunification only if she is employed, and she is anxious to be reunited with her husband.

Update as of February, 1984: The 26 year old brother-in-law of this household head had quit his former job since September, and is currently working for a distribution warehouse, making $4.50 per hour. He speaks English very well now, according to the resettlement agency staff. The head of household did not get along with her brother-in-law and finally decided to move to Louisiana in January 1984 with her son and daughter, while the brother-in-law remained in Arizona. She had a friend in Louisiana, and also said that she wants to go to school there. The resettlement agency says they have had no inquiry from the welfare agency in Louisiana yet, inquiring about this client.

Case 14 consists of a 31 year old man whose wife and children remain in Vietnam. He graduated high school in Vietnam, and served for four years as a combat officer in the military. Prior to 1975, he also had experience as a swimming instructor and doing newspaper layout in his father's business. After 1975, he spent three years in a reeducation camp, and was not permitted to hold any job after he was released, so he started trying to find his way out of the country.

Upon arrival in Arizona in July 1983, he was eager to find a job right away so he could start saving money to send back to help support his wife and children. He is also eager to apply to bring them to the United States. The refugee obtained his first part-time job two days after arrival. He subsequently obtained a full-time job at a bagel bakery, where his position was first subsidized by the Refugee Education Project as a training position, and later made permanent and unsubsidized.

This refugee has relatives and friends of his father who were among the 1975 wave of refugees to California. However, he is angry at these relatives for not doing more for his immediate family since they left, and he has made no attempt to get in touch with them. He also has friends in Seattle and in Florida, and indicated on his biodata that he would prefer to be resettled in Seattle, although he was willing to be resettled anywhere. At any rate, since arriving in Arizona, he has apparently not planned to move anywhere else.

The refugee gets along well with his sponsors, and usually visits them in their home once a week, where he often cooks dinner for them.

Update as of February, 1984: This individual was laid off from his bakery job when the store changed ownership. He was upset and thought about moving away. Instead, he went to Job Service which helped him get another job at a construction company after about ten days, where he now makes $4.00 per hour. He is studying English at the local community college.

Case 15 consists of a 37 year old man and his two stepbrothers, ages 15 and 17. The adult brother had served in the Vietnamese Air Force, and had spent two years in the U.S. previously, while receiving training for the air force. After the fall of Saigon, he spent six years in a reeducation camp in Vietnam. When he escaped, his parents asked him to take his two stepbrothers with him.

After arriving in Arizona on May 17, 1983, the family was provided with an apartment by the resettlement agency. Within two weeks after arrival, the head of the household obtained a job with a local electronics firm. The job required good English skills, which he had. This same firm is currently planning to open a new plant in a nearby town for which they plan to hire up to 90% Southeast Asians to make up the work force. The resettlement agency staff speculates that this refugee will be in a good position to be promoted to a supervisory position when and if this happens. He has already received a pay increase and currently makes $4.25 per hour.

The two younger brothers, who are both enrolled in the same grade in high school, are also doing well at learning English. Because the high school closest to their home does not offer ESL, they commute to a high school further away from home. The older of the two stepbrothers just got a part-time job in September 1983. One complaint expressed by this family was disappointment that the oldest brother's job meant that the two schoolage brothers were disqualified from receiving free bus passes for transportation to school. At the time of the site visit, the family was planning to move in several days' time to a larger, nicer two-bedroom apartment, which their three-person household would share with three other adults.

This family is eager to have other family members who are still in Vietnam join them in the U.S. and has already begun the paperwork for the Affidavit of Relationship, which is the first step in the process. Although the head of household says he has relatives in California, they must be distant relatives, as he does not appear to be in close contact with them, or to be making plans to move or visit them.

Update as of February, 1984: The head of this household is still working at the same job, but has received raises increasing his hourly wage to $5.25 per hour. He has a very positive attitude about working, and wants to continue working while going to school part-time to upgrade his skills. His two stepbrothers are rapidly improving their English while attending high school. (The older brother is now completely in mainstreamed classes and has American as well as Vietnamese friends). Both stepbrothers have part-time jobs in addition to attending high school. The household is still very eager to have his wife and children come to the U.S. from Vietnam.

Case 16 consists of a 23 year old single man with previous experience as a student (before 1975) and a rice farmer (after 1975), who arrived in Arizona on January 13, 1983. Immediately after arrival, he shared an apartment with his sponsor, an American lawyer, who is a bachelor. The refugee's brother and the brother's wife were in a refugee camp at the same time and were originally planning to be resettled with the wife's relatives in Spring Valley, California, but instead ended up coming to Arizona as a family reunification case. The brother and his wife are now living in the same apartment with this refugee (who moved out of his sponsor's apartment after four and a half months).

About two months after arriving in Arizona, the refugee obtained a job as a termite control sprayer. The job was originally organized as a vocational training job by the Refugee Education Project, paying $3.57 per hour, but it has now become a permanent job, and the wage has increased to $4.00 per hour. The refugee likes his job and is good friends with his coworker, an American.

The refugee's long-term plans are to go to the university. In the slightly shorter run, he has been saving his money to purchase a car, and at the time of the site visit, was about to buy a car several days later at an auction of old county cars, with the help of his sponsor. Shortly after arrival, the refugee studied English by listening to tapes prepared for him by his sponsor. He now is attending ESL classes at Pima College every night.

Although he doesn't like the hot summers in Arizona, the refugee plans to stay in Arizona for the time being. Unlike many other refugees whose families would like to come to the U.S. to join them, this refugee says that, except for his brother who is already here, his parents and brothers and sisters don't want to come to the U.S. They want to stay in Vietnam, even though all their land has been taken away from them by the government. This refugee left because he didn't want to be forced to fight in Cambodia.

Update as of February, 1984: The major change occurred for this refugee when his brother and wife moved to California so they could get access to Chinese medicine for the wife's health problems. When his brother left, this refugee quit his job and obtained his brother's former job as a construction worker making $4.50 per hour. He may decide to join his brother in California.

Case 17 consists of a single 34 year old woman, her 16 year old brother, and her five year old nephew (the son of another brother). The head of this household had priority to come to the U.S. because she was a truck driver in Vietnam, working for an American company. When she left Vietnam, she brought her brother and nephew with her.

After arriving in Arizona on February 25, 1983, the head of household soon obtained a job with a local knitting company with a work force which is about 70% Asian. She is experiencing stress related to her job, due to the fact that the work is sometimes sporadic. For example, during the week of the site visit, her work had been cut back to four hours per day, instead of the usual eight, which was creating financial difficulties. She would like to be able to study English and get a better job in the electronics field.

The 16 year old brother was scheduled to enter the Job Corps soon. The five year old nephew is enrolled in public school.

This household shares a two-bedroom apartment with another three-person family which consists of a couple and their baby. The head of household says she likes this apartment, which the resettlement agency located for them, but she wishes she lived closer to work, so she would not have to bicycle eight miles each way to work every day. She is planning to get her driver's license, but had just failed the test on the first attempt.

The head of household had never married in Vietnam, and would be interested in getting married now that she is in the U.S.

When she first learned she was coming to the U.S., the head of household wanted to go to Illinois because she had neighbors from Vietnam who were in Illinois. She doesn't seem to be planning to move now that she is settled in Arizona. She would like to have more members of her family from Vietnam come to the U.S., but says she doesn't own enough for them to come yet.

Update as of February, 1984: Since September, the head of this household has moved to California with her young nephew. She said she would go to school for one year to learn English and would then return to Arizona. She moved to a city where her aunt lives. Her brother, who is enrolled in Job Corps, decided to remain in Arizona.

Case 18 consists of a 34 year old man who was a high school chemistry and physics teacher in Vietnam. He is living with three other young men who arrived as part of the FASP program, and is working for an electronics company painting circuit boards. He is the only refugee working at this company, and his English is excellent.

The tragedy of this refugee's history is that his wife and children tried to escape at the same time and left in a boat before him. They must have died in the escape effort, since they have never turned up in a refugee camp.

The refugee has a car, and in the five months since arriving in Arizona has visited California and returned to Arizona. He would like to study electronics so that he can get a better job.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still living in Arizona and still working at the same job.

Case 19 consists of the "principal applicant," a 42 year old woman who used to work at an American PX at an airport in Vietnam, her 53 year old husband, and their 12 year old daughter. A 22 year old son who left Vietnam in 1981 is presumed dead, or at least his location is unknown to them. In Vietnam, the husband worked as an auto mechanic and driver, managing a business with 20 to 25 employees. He is upset that since his arrival in April 1983, he has been unable to obtain employment.

The wife was employed for about a month as a motel maid, but was laid off by a new supervisor who was not impressed with the fact that she did a thorough job cleaning, but told her she was too slow. She would like another job, and her preference is to get a job in a restaurant, since she has experience serving Americans from her PX job in Vietnam. She is currently taking care of a baby for a friend who is working during the day.

The family is currently receiving Refugee Cash Assistance of $230 per month.

This family does have a distant relative (husband's cousin) in Marina, California, and had originally requested to be resettled in California, if possible. Nevertheless, they do not have any apparent plans to move to California. The family is living in a home within walking distance of the Refugee Center, and is pleased that their apartment complex now has seven Vietnamese families living there who visit back and forth.

Update as of February, 1984: Since September, the principal applicant had obtained employment at a manufacturing plant. Her husband had been placed in several different jobs. They both quit their jobs to move to California in January, 1984. The resettlement agency staff reported stories that she has been able to earn a lot of money in California by working as a fortune teller.

Case 20 consists of a single male who is 19 years old. His father is dead; his mother and three sisters are still in Vietnam. This refugee is ethnic Chinese. After arriving in Arizona on April 24, 1983, he was placed in an apartment which he shared with three other single FASP refugees. Slightly less than two months after arriving in the U.S., the refugee went to work for a local transformer company at minimum wage. After starting work, he moved into an apartment on his own, which he shared with three other co-workers.

Before leaving Vietnam, this young man was a fisherman. When he entered the U.S., his English was rated at "C" level by the refugee processing center. He has not chosen to attend ESL classes since arriving in Arizona. The resettlement agency worker mentioned that they had had to counsel this refugee about saving his money and paying his rent on time. He has been diligent about saving money to buy a motorcycle, which he recently purchased.

No relatives in the U.S. were shown on this refugee's biodata, and he has not indicated interest in moving away from Arizona.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee now lives in an apartment with a Vietnamese family, next door to the apartment in which his co-workers and fellow FASP arrivals live. (He wanted a quieter environment.) He understands more English now, but is still shy about speaking English.

He sold his motorcycle (or what was left of it) after he lent it to a friend who got in an accident with it. (Although he had insurance, his friend was driving without a license, so he did not make an insurance claim.)

Case 21 consists of a 31 year old brother and a 25 year old sister who are ethnic Chinese. The brother had been a welder in Vietnam, where he had worked with his father, and the sister had been a dressmaker. This family was sponsored by a Lutheran church. After arriving on March 5, 1983, both the brother and sister were able to find jobs with the same firm, a furniture manufacturing plant, within about three weeks after arrival. The brother's job is full-time, while the sister works part-time and does some dressmaking work on the side.

After beginning work, this family moved into a house which they share with another family. The head of this second household, who has a car, drives the brother and sister to work every day.

Although they studied English in the refugee camp, these refugees are very shy about speaking English. Before they moved, they attended ESL classes two evenings every week, but they are now living too far from the site of the nearest refugee ESL class. Their sponsor is trying to arrange for them to attend Adult Basic Education ESL classes closer to their home.

The brother would like to obtain work as a welder, using his work skills. His congregational sponsor is trying to help him enter training as a welder, but the waiting lists are too long. The sister would like to study electronics or computer programming.

With the help of the sponsor, the family is also trying to get other family members to join them through the ODP program. The sister said that she misses her family a lot, and even after two years in the refugee camp and six months in the U.S., she often cries herself to sleep.

The family used to live near their congregational sponsor's contact person, in a house that he had located for them, and he used to visit them frequently. Since they have moved to another location and started working, they see him less often.

The sister said (through an interpreter) that she was happy to be in the U.S., because in Vietnam all their family's possessions had been taken away from them. They heard people in the camps talking about welfare, she said, but they didn't listen because they wanted to be self-sufficient.

Update as of February, 1984: Both refugees are still working at the same jobs and the sister in this family has gotten an expanded work schedule and is working more hours than previously. They are still in close touch with their congregational sponsor, who would agree to help sponsor other members of their family if they are allowed to leave Vietnam. According to resettlement agency staff, the brother and sister in this case are now living in an apartment on their own. They are progresing slowly in learning English.

Case 22 consists of a 21 year old single man who arrived in Arizona on March 2, 1983. His parents as well as two or three siblings remain in Vietnam. The refugee had worked as a jeweler in Vietnam for two years, and within six days after he arrived in Arizona, the Job Service office had found a job for him making belt buckles with inlaid Indian stones for a company which sells Indian handcrafts. The job is a permanent full-time job paying $3.75 per hour to start, and offering health insurance as one of the fringe benefits.

This young man knew very little English when he arrived in Arizona. However, according to the resettlement agency caseworker, he has become Americanized very fast. He saves most of his money, and frequently sends presents to his parents in Vietnam. He has already purchased a car with his savings. Immediately after arrival, he attended ESL classes.

This is an interesting case of reverse secondary migration. The refugee did have an uncle living in California who was about 35 years old. The uncle moved to Arizona to join his nephew, and was assisted by the voluntary resettlement agency to find a job. When the uncle was laid off from the first job, he was assisted in finding a second job.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still working in his first job as a stone polisher but would like to get into a good electronics job. His employer considers him a good worker and has increased his wage to at least $4.00 per hour. This refugee speaks English quite well now, according to the resettlement agency worker, who says she chats with this refugee every day on the phone (as a friend).

When his uncle first moved to Arizona from California, the refugee lived with his uncle. After his uncle began living with an American girlfriend, the FASP refugee moved to an apartment with two other refugees his own age.

Case 23 consists of a single male of about 25 years of age who arrived in Arizona in May 1983. His entire family remained in Vietnam, and he had no friends or relatives in other locations in the U.S. It took this young man almost two months to find a job. His English skills are "not that bad," but he is extremely shy. Finally, Job Service and the resettlement agency both found him a job on the same day. He accepted the job obtained by Job Service, which was with a metal plating company and paid minimum wage, but offered a better opportunity for pay raises over time. At the time of the site visit, he had been working about three weeks.

Before he obtained employment, this refugee did not attend ESL classes, and according to the caseworker, "didn't do much of anything." He is still living in his original living arrangement with four other single FASP male refugees. Because he is so shy, the resettlement caseworker doesn't have a good idea about what his career goals really are.

Update as of February, 1984: Since September, the refugee had quit his minimum wage job and obtained a job in an electronic assembly plant where he makes $4.25 per hour working the night shift. He is still living with the same housemates as before. The resettlement agency staff say he is adjusting very well.

Case 24 consists of a single male, aged 21, who arrived in Arizona on March 9, 1983. He was placed in a three-bedroom house with six or seven other FASP new arrivals. The refugee's immediate family, consisting of ten siblings and his parents, remain in Vietnam. The family is ethnic Chinese. The FASP refugee's father is a farmer and silversmith, and the refugee himself had worked as a goldsmith in Vietnam.

The young man's biodata indicated that he had a relative in Texas, and that he would like to live in a city with a large Vietnamese community. However, he also indicated while in the camp that he was willing to resettle anywhere. Upon arrival in the U.S., he decided not to attend ESL classes for refugees offered in the community. (His English level in the refugee processing center had been rated at level "D".)

The refugee in this case obtained a job at a transformer company one or two months after arrival, along with several of the other single males who entered at about the same time. After they became responsible for paying their own rent, the seven young men who were living together all moved to a smaller house in order to save money on rent. The young man appears to be stably settled in Arizona.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still working at the same job. He is now attending ESL classes two nights a week and his English speaking ability has improved. He just purchased a car.

Case 25 consisted of a 34 year old woman, her 27 year old brother, her seven year old child, and a new baby, born after their arrival in Arizona on January 19, 1983. After the head of household got a job in a knitting company in a nearby suburb, the family moved closer to the job site, where they shared a house with other refugees. The 27 year old brother, who was blind in one eye (though the condition was supposed to be correctible by surgery) attempted unsuccessfully to get into a CETA training program.

At some point during the family's stay in Arizona, the baby's father, who was living in Texas, came to visit but returned to Texas. (He evidently had a wife already, still back in Vietnam.)

Finally, at the end of May 1983, a friend living in California convinced the family to move to California and actually came in a car and got them to move to Riverside, California. The head of household quit her job to make the move. Ten days after the family departed, the Riverside welfare office called to say they had applied for welfare. (Even if sanctioned for quitting a job, the refugees are only delayed one month in obtaining welfare.) The official reason listed in the MIS form for making the migration was "educational opportunities."

The resettlement agency caseworker ran into the head of household in California while he was vacationing there several months after she departed Arizona, and he reported that she was very happy in California.

Update as of February, 1984: There was no new news about this case.

Case 26 consists of a 22 year old woman, her 17 year old niece and her 17 year old cousin. The niece and cousin are both attending high school, while the 22 year old has taken the responsibility for being the immediate support of the household and is working full time in an air conditioner manufacturing plant at $3.35 per hour. She is happy to work overtime so that she can save money to send presents back to her family in Vietnam.

The oldest woman finished the eleventh grade in Vietnam and worked as a secretary there from 1978 to 1981. After arriving in Arizona on January 19, 1983, her first job was a training position in a dress shop at $3.50 per hour, arranged for her about a month after her arrival by the Refugee Education Project. The employer could not afford to keep her on as an employee after the training period was over. After being laid off from this job, the Refugee Job Service office helped her to obtain her current job at the manufacturing plant, which pays minimum wage.

Although she is supporting her relatives now, this refugee would like to go to college to learn to be an electrical technician after she learns enough English. She is currently attending ESL classes at night.

The 17 year old cousin and niece got summer youth jobs last summer in order to earn money for school books and other school expenses. Ironically, this income was enough so that it disqualified them from receiving Food Stamps during the summer months.

This household has received a lot of attention and support from their sponsor, a young Italian woman (who only came to the U.S. one year ago herself, but whose English is fluent) who has visited them often and counseled them on their personal lives. In recent months, as they have become more settled, this relationship has become less important.

Update as of February, 1984: The head of this young household now works for an electronics firm. The cousin (who now says she is just a friend) has moved out of the household. The niece who is still attending high school lives there, as do two younger men who share the apartment. The household head receives an AFDC grant on behalf of her niece.

Case 27 consists of a 19 year old single man who had been a student in Vietnam before escaping. His family remains in Vietnam, and he would like to be able to have his family come to the U.S. He has no relatives in the U.S.

This refugee arrived in Arizona on March 7, 1983, and was placed in an apartment with other single men arriving under the FASP program. When he arrived, he was almost blind in one eye. His condition was correctible by implant surgery, however, and an operation paid for by the Refugee Medical Program has left him with much improved vision. (The recovery period for this surgery is usually one year, and he is recovering very well.)

By July 15, a little over three months after arrival in Arizona, the refugee was able to begin working at a job located for him by a volunteer working with the resettlement agency. The job is for an electronics firm making sample electronic parts, and pays $3.50 per hour.

Although he knew very little English when he arrived in Arizona, this refugee is currently studying in a group of young men who are working with a volunteer to prepare for taking the GED exam. The resettlement caseworker commented that he thought this refugee was stably resettled in Arizona and would not migrate elsewhere.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is still working at the same job. His vision is continuing to improve. He has moved in with a different group of single refugee men.

Case 28 consists of a 32 year old woman, her five children ranging in age from two to 12, and her 19 year old brother. The head of household's husband was caught during an escape effort and arrested, and is in prison in Vietnam. Prior to leaving Vietnam, the wife had worked as a dressmaker, in a restaurant, and as a produce seller. The family arrived in Arizona on March 7, 1983 and was provided with an apartment in the home of her sponsor. About six weeks after arrival, the head of household inquired about welfare and went to the welfare office to sign up for AFDC benefit. This was very upsetting to her sponsor, who had gone out and raised $500 in private donations from charitable organizations so that the family would be able to avoid going on welfare until the head of household obtained a job. The level of welfare benefits received was $360 per month in AFDC benefits, and $306 per month in Food Stamps. Meanwhile, the 19 year old brother left the household and enrolled in the Job Corps, while the three oldest children were attending public school.

Finally, in June 1983, the head of household obtained a training position with a local motel as a motel maid. This reduced her welfare benefits, but did not make her ineligible for a lower income supplement. The training program was operated by the Refugee Education Project (the same program which operates refugee ESL classes) and consisted of a partial subsidy of the employee's wages until the end of a brief training period, at which time the trainee is either laid off or retained as an unsubsidized employee. The refugee was retained in this job, which paid minimum wage, beyond the training period, but was laid off in August 1983 when a new housekeeping supervisor took over who had less sympathy and patience with her somewhat slow performance. As of September, she had not obtained a new job. She is currently receiving a full welfare grant once again.

The refugee had recently been diagnosed by a doctor as having an ulcer, which she associated with being upset about her husband in jail, and upset about her father, who is sick. In September, she had also moved to a new apartment closer to the Refugee Center. In this new location, she is in the same complex as other refugee families and can also walk to the grocery store. She is able to attend ESL classes in the evening at the Refugee Center.

In an interview, the refugee commented that she would probably stay in Arizona because she "doesn't know where else to go."

Update as of February, 1984: This individual is now working full-timein a manufacturing plant during night shift. Her neighbor and her oldest child help her in her child care responsibilities.

She no longer receives any welfare grant, although Food Stamps help supplement her income. She is planning to buy a car, but doesn't yet know how to drive. Resettlement agency staff report that she is now "on her own" except when she needs assistance responding to special needs of her children. She has made great strides in adjusting to life in the U.S. during the last six months.

Case 29 consisted of a single 31 year old woman who arrived in Arizona on March 2. She was originally housed in an apartment with another three-person household.

Shortly after arrival, she was offered a job at a local knitting company, but she refused the job, saying that she wanted to move to California to get welfare. After refusing the job, she was placed at the end of the list of individuals to receive services from the Refugee Job Services. The refugee did not attend any ESL classes after arrival in Arizona.

Finally, on May 9, a little over two months after initial arrival, she migrated to California. The resettlement agency office in California wrote to the local affiliate in Arizona to find out whether she should be permitted to enroll in welfare right away, and were told that she had turned down work in Arizona.

Subsequent to her migration to California, her cousin, who was scheduled to come to Arizona from the refugee processing center as a family reunification case, was transferred to an East Coast office of the same resettlement agency (as far from California as they could arrange, since she wasn't eligible to be reunited with her relative in California as an initial resettlement location).

Update as of February, 1984: The resettlement agency has had no further contact with this case.

Case 30 consists of a single 20 year old male who arrived in Arizona on June 23, 1983. His parents and brother and sister remain in Vietnam. He had been rated level "D" on English in the refugee processing center. This youth, who had worked in Vietnam as a farmer and fisherman, was placed on a job by the Job Service using the target job tax credit (TJTC) for disadvantaged youth. He began working within one week after arriving in Arizona in a metal plating company, for $3.35 per hour.

The refugee is living with three other single FASP men in a two-bedroom apartment. He saved enough money to buy a $200 car, but has run into a snag in getting his driver's license. He didn't remember his birthdate, and the project "assigned" him a birthdate to use, but the Department of Motor Vehicles doesn't consider this official enough and won't permit him to take the driver's test.

The refugee is currently studying English with a volunteer teacher from the refugee ESL program who comes to his home. He is presently fully financially independent. He never enrolled in Food Stamps at all, since he found a job so soon after arrival.

Update as of February, 1984: In about November, this youth was fired from his job, according to resettlement agency workers, for failure to show up for scheduled overtime work. He has not yet obtained another job, but is still living off his savings.

He currently lives with some relatives who belong to a refugee family resettled by another agency.

After being refused a driver's license by the state because his I94 did not show his birthdate, this youth was supposed to write his parents in Vietnam to obtain a copy of this birth certificate. In the interim, he was apparently driving without a license and got into trouble when he got in an accident. The resettlement agency worker has been assisting him in dealing with the court system, but she is worried, because he has not yet gotten another job.

Case 31 consists of a 46 year old woman and her five children, ranging in age from 9 to 23 years. This refugee worked as a cook's assistant for the U.S. Army for five years from 1966 to 1971. Her husband was killed in the war in 1973. After 1975, the children in this family were not permitted to go to school. During one of five escape attempts, the head of household's leg was injured, so she needs to be able to find light work. A married daughter remains behind in Vietnam. Another married child is in a refugee processing center.

The family arrived in Arizona on August 17, 1983. Four of the children are now in school. The oldest son, who is 23, was about to leave for his first day of work at a factory at the time of the visit to their home in early September. He had previously attempted to enter an electronics training program offered by an employer, but had not been selected to receive the training. The head of household has not yet obtained a job, but would like a job as a chef's assistant.

The family has a few relatives from Vietnam who came to the United States in 1975, but they don't have addresses for any of them.

Update as of February, 1984: The head of household in this family now works part-time in a restaurant, which is all she can work because of her old leg injury. Several changes have occurred to the composition of the household: the son moved out of the home, then moved to Phoenix, and has recently moved back home. He bought a motorcycle, which he has to make payments on, so he no longer contributes his entire salary to the household's expenses. The oldest daughter ran away from home in December and now lives at the Job Corps center, where she is enrolled.

The head of household's oldest marrried daughter and her son-in-law recently arrived in the U.S. from a refugee camp. They were initially placed in Texas, but the head of household insisted that they come to Arizona. They may not stay in Arizona.

Case 32 consists of a 31 year old single man and his two sisters, ages 13 and 8, who arrived in Arizona on April 24, 1983. The young man was in the army prior to 1975, and after 1975 supported himself by doing odd jobs. The parents of these refugees are still in Vietnam, but three more brothers are in refugee camps and are expected to arrive in the U.S. in three months. The young man knew "a little English" when he arrived in Arizona.

After this family arrived in Arizona, it was decided that it would be best for the family if the two sisters were to live with an American family, which had agreed to sponsor them. They go to school, and visit their brother very often. The young man was helped to locate lodging in an apartment with other single FASP men.

Volunteers who work with the resettlement agency found the young man a job in an electrical factory doing assembly work making transformers, which pays $3.50 per hour for 40 hours a week. He began working on May 20, less than one month after arrival. He receives health insurance as part of his job benefits, and is now completely independent, receiving neither Food Stamps nor medical assistance. He likes his job but would like to advance up a career ladder, which may require moving to another job after awhile.

A Vietnamese who has been in the U.S. for a longer time is volunteering to come to the apartment of the refugee and the other single men he lives with to teach them English three times a week.

This refugee has shown no interest in moving to California; he expresses his belief that in California the Vietnamese community is too crowded, and he is also fearful of the organized crime that is rumored to be rampant within the Vietnamese community in California (gangs shaking down merchants, etc.). The resettlement agency is encouraging this refugee to start applying to have his parents move to the U.S. under the ODP program.

Update as of February, 1984: In October, this refugee's two brothers arrived from the refugee camps. They are 20 and 16 years old. The 20 year old obtained a job in an electrical assembly plant while the 16 year old is enrolled in high school. The three brothers live together and are often visited by the two sisters who still live with an

American foster family. According to resettlement agency staff,this family is stably resettled and doesn't require further assistance from the agency.

Case 33 consists of a 56 year old man who was a helicopter mechanic in Vietnam during the war. After the war, he served time in a reeducation camp. This refugee arrived in Arizona in May 1983, and decided that he wanted to become a jet plane or helicopter mechanic. His English is excellent. After calling Hughes Aircraft to inquire about how he could become a licensed aircraft mechanic, he learned that he would have to attend a school for two months, which would cost about $1,000 to get his FAA license.

This refugee has friends in California, Florida, and Texas, and at first talked a little about moving to one of these places. However, after he discovered that Arizona would be the cheapest place to study aircraft maintenance, he decided to stay in Arizona to go to school. About two months after he arrived in Arizona, the refugee obtained his first job, with assistance from the Refugee Job Services program. The job was installing steel frames into sofa beds for a sofa bed manufacturing company at minimum wage, and he quit this job because the work was too hard. Because he had quit the job, and because a new group of FASP refugee had arrived in the interim, he was no longer a high priority case for Job Service services. Thus, he found his second job for himself, making wood screws for $4.25 per hour.

Initially the refugee was housed in a two-bedroom apartment with three other FASP refugees. However, when his housemates all got jobs at an electronic circuits company, they moved to be closer to their jobs. At this point, the refugee found his own place to move to and notified the resettlement agency that he had made the move.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee is currently sharing an apartment with two other Vietnamese families, neither of whom were FASP cases. He is working in an auto painting shop, making $5.00 per hour, but he doesn't like his job because he feels there are health hazards associated with it.

He says that he is happy to be in the U.S., but is sad because he misses his wife and six children (aged 18 to 35), who are still in Vietnam. He would still like to enter a training program after he obtains Arizona residency (after twelve months) but he is now looking forward to retirement, which he says should occur about the same time he obtains U.S. citizenship.

Case 34 consists of a 20 year old young man who arrived in Arizona on April 16, 1983. His family remains in Vietnam. The refugee had had no prior work experience in Vietnam. His English language skills were "next to nothing" when he came. He attended ESL classes at least for awhile after arrival.

With the help of a resettlement agency volunteer, he obtained a job working for a mailing service less than one week after arrival. The job pays minimum wage. He is living in an apartment with other single men resettled in Arizona under the FASP program. He likes his job.

For one month, this refugee received Food Stamps. Now he is financially independent.

The resettlement caseworker observed that this young man is spending a lot of money on telephone calls to Colorado where his girlfriend lives. (She is living with her parents.) The caseworker told me that it would not look good to her family if he were to move to Colorado to be closer to her. It is important for him to have a job and earn money. The refugee has no relatives elsewhere in the United States.

Update as of February, 1984: This refugee has been promoted to a supervisor position at his job and now makes $5.25 per hour. He is seen as a very reliable employer. He has changed apartments and housemates (after getting in trouble with one landlord for playing music too loud) and is currently living with one FASP refugee and one newer arrival.

He now has a Cambodian girlfriend who lives in Arizona.

Case 35 consists of a 50 year old man whose wife and children remain behind in Vietnam. He was in the military in Vietnam prior to 1975, and also has a work history in radio and television repair. This refugee is living in an apartment with single FASP refugee men, but the caseworker commented that this apartment is occupied by the "studious young men," not the ones who like to party.

Within one day after his arrival in Arizona on April 5, 1983, this refugee started working as a gas station attendant. He is currently working at a job with more potential for career advancement — he works for an electronics firm learning to be an electronics technician. Volunteers working with the resettlement agency found both of these jobs for him.

This refugee spoke English quite well when he arrived, having been in the United States before (while in the military). According to the resettlement worker, he is "a very fine person." He has been able to purchase a car and since he has health insurance benefits from his job, he is completely financially independent.

Update as of February, 1984: According to resettlement agency staff, this individual is still working at the same job, and "doesn't need us to hold his hand."

Case 36 is a 26 year old man whose wife and child escaped from Vietnam at the same time that he did, but who left in different boats. They are presently in a refugee camp and will be resettled in Arizona and reunited with him when they come to the U.S. (The resettlement agency has assisted him in applying for family reunification with his wife and child.)

Prior to 1975, the refugee was a student in Vietnam. After the war ended, he worked as a carpenter. When he arrived in Arizona on June 8, 1983, he knew very little English. He was placed in an apartment with other young men who were FASP cases, and assisted to find a job. About six weeks after arrival, he started working at a mailing service (where at least one other FASP arrival was working) for minimum wage. A volunteer from the refuge ESL program comes to the apartment of these young men to teach English.

According to the resettlement agency caseworker, this refugee is doing very well. At first he was very worried about being able to be reunited with his family, but now he is excited and happy that they will be coming to Arizona.

Update as of February, 1984: In December, 1983, the wife and two children (ages two and five) of this refugee arrived. The refugee is still working at the same job, and his wife is working at home hand-packing products for sale on a piecework basis.

This family receives foodstamps and the wife just applied for a welfare supplement, on her own initiative.

The English language skills of these adults is not yet very good. At the time of the second site visit, the wife was beginning to attend ESL classes operated by the refugee program.

Case 37 consists of a 50 year-old husband, his 47 year-old wife, and their eight children, ranging in age from 3 to 19 years old. The head of household had worked in Vietnam as a farmer, a fisherman, and as the manager of an Exxon gas station. At the time of the site visit, another adult son and his wife and children had recently arrived in Phoenix and the entire extended family of seventeen people was happily living in a three bedroom house in Glendale, a suburb adjacent to Phoenix. He located his current house himself, and it is in quite a pleasant wooded location, adjacent to an old farm.

Three individuals in the immediate ten-person case were of an employable age: the 19 year-old daughter, and the husband and wife. The first to secure employment was the daughter, who was placed by Job Serice in a knitting factory at $3.80 per hour, within three weeks of arrival. Almost exactly one month after arrival, the wife was also placed in a sewing job by Job Service, paying $3.80 per hour. Finally, when the husband was starting to be discouraged, he found a job doing construction work. This first job lasted only nine days. A second job, working as a janitor, has proved to be more stable, and has lasted five months so far. This job pays $3.75 per hour.

Because of his experience working with cars, the head of household was able to purchase a cheap car during his second month in the U.S., and put it in running condition. He is currently working on a second cheap care for the family.

The family is still receiving Food Stamps, and Arizona's Medical Assistance Only program for refugees, but is at least partially self-sufficient. Before the husband obtained his job, he threatened to move with seven children to California, leaving his wife and oldest daughter working in Arizona. The husband's two sisters live in California and own a sewing factory there. Finally, he decided to stay and called Job Service, and said, "you have to find me a job." The situation seems to have stabilized, and the family is now planning ahead to when they will be able to buy a home in Phoenix.

This family's story is significant because they resisted extreme pressure from relatives in California in order to come to Arizona. Apparently, they have approximately 50 relatives in the San Francisco area, who found out when they were traveling through Hamilton Air Force Base on their way to Arizona and showed up with a car at the Air Force Base in the middle of the night to take them away to San Francisco. They decided to come to Arizona instead.

Update as of February, 1984: Shortly after arriving in Arizona, the son, daughter-in-law, and grandchild of this family (who had arrived in September as a family reunification case) moved to California.

Since September, the head of household left his job. (The resettlement agency worker said that he quit, claiming that he had not been paid for some overtime he had worked, knowing that the employer was not happy with him, and was going to fire him.) The entire family, with the exception of the oldest daughter, moved to California in January, 1984, just over 12 months after having arrived in Arizona. They moved in order to realize the greater household income possible from welfare in California.

The nineteen year-old daughter remained in Arizona. Since September, she had quit her knitting company job, and had obtained employment at an electronic assembly plant at a wage of $3.75 per hour.

## APPENDIX F:

## Case Profiles of FASP Refugees in North Carolina

Family A is considered by resettlement agency staff as one of the most interesting FASP families in their city, and one of the families that will ultimately be the most successfully resettled. The family consists of a husband and wife, ages 28 and 26 respectively, and three brothers, ages 24, 18, and 15. The husband had five years' education in Cambodia. He had worked as a carpenter and had spent three years in the military. The background of the other family members is less well-documented.

At the time of the first BPA site visit, both the husband and his wife were nearing completion of a six-month vocational training class in upholstery (a high-demand skill in the local area). Their instructor stated that the husband was the best and most innovative student he had ever encountered, and that the wife was the top sewing student in the class. Both had skilled, well-paying jobs awaiting them upon completion of the course, working for a furniture manufacturer. This same furniture manufacturer has already hired the husband's oldest brother in a less skilled capacity at $4.00 per hour (recently raised to $4.25), and thought highly of his refugee worker.

The oldest brother was initially reluctant to share his income with the rest of the family, since he was the only one working. LFS staff mentioned to him that perhaps he would like to do his own cooking and shopping and household chores if he wanted to keep his income to himself; he quickly changed his mind.

This family subsisted for several months on the single income of $170 per week, plus about $336 per month in Food Stamps and Refugee Cash Assistance combined. (The household has been "split" for the purpose of defining eligibility for cash assistance.) They received donations of two old cars and had been able to buy the required insurance for them. They spent a lot of time working on the cars and keeping them in good repair, but it took several months before they learned to drive them, with the help of volunteers.

This family benefited from a great deal of voluntary assistance. An American tutor took on the task of helping the wife to improve her English, since her vocational training schedule conflicted with the Community College ESL classes. (The wife's English was already quite good, and soon became even better.) This volunteer tutor became good friends with the entire family, and now drives them to the Vietnamese market and the supermarket once a week to do their shopping.

Family A is becoming Americanized very quickly. They live in a well-maintained second-story apartment in an old house where three other FASP families live. Resettlement agency staff are betting that before too long, with three or four adults earning good wages and their "entrepreneurial" approach to earning extra money, this family will be buying a house of their own.

The English language skills of all members of the household are good. The slowest to learn is the youngest brother, who is in high school. He took part in a one-time summer ESL/orientation program designed specifically for high-school-age Cambodian refugees and that appeared to help. In summary, agency staff do not spend a great deal of time worrying about Family A. They seem well-adjusted and happy in their new home.

At the time of the second BPA visit, Mr. A. had just begun a new job. His first job had been satisfactory enough; it was varied and interesting, but it was seen as being a dead end situation, not building strongly enough on the upholstering skills he had acquired in school. His new job was in a factory manufacturing office furniture. It began at $4.00 per hour and held the promise of raises and promotions. However, after a week on the new job, Mr. A. was showing signs of boredom. While not complaining, he appeared to think that the job was more repetitive than he would have liked.

Case B consists of a 24-year-old man, his 22-year-old pregnant wife, and a two-year-old daughter. They had lived on a farm prior to 1975, and the head of household served in the military for five years. He had seven years of education in his home country, while his wife had none at all, and still does not know how to read or write in any language. The husband was rated as having a "C" level of English competency upon leaving the refugee processing center.

When Family B arrived in North Carolina in early February, they were housed in a temporary apartment which the resettlement agency maintains for new arrivals. Within two weeks they were registered for refugee cash assistance and Food Stamps, totaling about $400 per month. Both attended ESL classes regularly and were conscientious students. The wife made minimal progress, and no definite plans were made for her to continue. The husband advanced steadily and was pronounced ready to move on to the next class.

Two months after arrival, resettlement agency staff found a job for Mr. B as a production worker, with a full-time wage of $3.50 per hour. Three days later, the agency received a telephone call from the employer. Mr. B was standing at his work station, as though in a trance, unable to move or talk. Gradually staff were able to learn what had happened. Mr. B had been a victim of torture during his military career. The torture was of a fairly prevalent type: being completely encased in a large plastic bag and (alternately) smothered to the point of unconsciousness and beaten with the butt of a rifle until consciousness was regained. Mr. B had never talked about this experience, so that neither the staff nor the employer could have foreseen the effects of placing him on a production line which included wrapping the final product in plastic. The effects were severe enough to preclude employment and to initiate a series of mental health treatments, as both an inpatient and an outpatient.

Resettlement agency staff were convinced that Mr. B's condition was improving, and began again to discuss employment with him. He stated repeatedly that he wanted to work. As an interim measure and in order to assess his work readiness, they hired him to do some light maintenance work at the refugee office. He proved incapable of concentrating on a task for more than a few minutes. Still, staff felt that his mental health was improving until one day in early September, when he threatened his wife with a knife. He was again referred for inpatient care. He was later released on the condition that he live separately from his wife and children; his wife was truly frightened. However, he could not stay away. Court orders and signed statements were of little avail. He could not believe that his wife wanted him to stay away. "While she lives here, she's still mine. If she moves away, she is not still mine." Mrs. B had no choice but to take the children away to live with her brother in another state, leaving Mr. B behind. He was heartbroken.

Despite the opinion of several experts that Mr. B's condition was not likely to improve, Mr. B was employed at the time of the second BPA visit. It was only a temporary job, and staff were keeping their fingers crossed. Mr. B will continue to have mental health problems and is depressed about being abandoned by his family. But his current employer is understanding and is most influenced by Mr. B's obvious desire to work and stabilize himself and regain his family's trust.

Case C consists of a 51-year-old head of household, his 36-year-old wife, a 16-year-old daughter, and a 14-year-old son. They arrived in North Carolina in early June. The head of household has five years' education and experience as a bus driver and in the military. During the family's three-year stay in the refugee camps, the head of household also gained experience as a carpenter. His wife had never held a job outside the home until arriving in the U.S. and has no education at all.

The husband was diagnosed as having a heart murmur upon arrival, and it was doubted whether he could work right away. The family was registered for cash assistance and Food Stamps about one week after arrival, and their total income from those sources was nearly $620. (This may be misleading, since the Food Stamp allocation is often combined when more than one family lives at the same address.) Their son is blind.

About two months after arrival, both the husband and wife began attending ESL classes. Two weeks later, the wife was placed in a production job in a textile factory. She worked at this minimum-wage job for over two months, and then was laid off (about two weeks before the BPA site visit). Staff are seeking another job for her. Meanwhile, her husband began working at a full-time job as a textile worker which pays $3.50. Despite health problems and minimal English skills, this family appears well on their way toward self-sufficiency and a stable life in North Carolina.

Case D consists of a 61-year-old man, his 64-year-old wife, and two grandchildren, ages 14 and 11. When they first arrived in North Carolina in mid-March, they were placed in a house which had been donated by a local church to be used as a refugee residence at no charge. Church members fixed up the house, which had been unoccupied for some time and had a leaking roof, and welcomed their new neighbor warmly. The house is cited as being one of the nicest FASP homes in the area. Americans are constantly "in and out of the house" and are anxious to help. The house is on the edge of town, however, and so this family does not see very much of the other FASP refugees. Agency staff see this family as clinging tightly to the old ways and resisting strongly any efforts to Americanize them.

Less than two months after this family's arrival, they were joined in Greensboro by their son, his pregnant wife, and three children (see Case E). Another son is due to arrive in December, having been delayed in departure because of a medical hold. However, this late arrival will be considered part of the total FASP caseload.

Both the older man and his wife are considered too old to work and support themselves, particularly at the physically demanding jobs that seem to be the rule for FASP refugees in their area. Their long-run source of support will be SSI, combined with any contributions that the two sons' families are eventually able to make toward their well-being.

Case E consists of a 30-year-old man, his 26-year-old wife, who is pregnant with their fourth child, and their three sons, ages 11, 6, and 2. The husband is the son of the older couple described in Case D. This family arrived in North Carolina on May 9, 1983.

While still in Cambodia, Mr. E had been captured three times and tortured repeatedly. He witnessed the brutal murders of several of his compatriots at the hands of the soldiers. He had watched as his brother was beheaded. The long-rang effects of these horrors on his ability to settle in this country are still being felt.

It was not until nearly three weeks after arrival of this family that resettlement agency staff learned about Mr. E's medical condition — a spleen condition that required prompt surgery. The surgery was apparently successful, but this refugee did not recover well. Many weeks later, he was still homebound, eating poorly, and during the week of the first BPA site visit he made it known that he intended to starve himself. The agency's health specialist spent many hours with the refugee, convinced him to eat, and apparently had changed his mind about dying. However, trouble continued. There were repeated arguments between Mr. E and his parents. He was not being a good son. The situation was exacerbated because they were living in the same house and did not have enough income to live in separate houses.

LFS staff met with the entire family on several occasions. They were able to convince Mr. E's father that, as head of the household, he should take charge. The father helped LFS staff convince Mr. E that he must go to the hospital. His week in the hospital helped him to stabilize his eating and sleeping patterns and to get used to the medication that would combat his depression.

In January 1984, LFS staff were able to find him a job working for a furniture manufacturer who also employs several other FASP refugees. Two months later he was still employed there, though he had missed work for health reasons. Agency staff are still somewhat concerned about Mr. E's health and mental health.

Case F consists of a 42-year-old man, his 41-year-old wife, who at arrival was pregnant with their seventh child, and their children, who range from 18 to one year of age. The husband and the oldest son each have two years of education; no one else in the family, including the wife, had ever been to school before arriving in the U.S. The wife has never held a job. They arrived in North Carolina in mid-May.

This family lives on one of the lower-cost apartments in a less-than-ideal neighborhood (not one of the newer apartments in the large apartment complex where a number of other FASP refugees live). They subsist on approximately $455 in Food Stamps and $291 in refugee cash assistance, which they began receiving within weeks after their arrival. This family has also received a great deal of donated (and purchased) clothing, new kitchen appliances, and other household items, since they have severely limited resources. They were registered about one month after their arrival for a WIC supplement, which will be ongoing, since their baby is young and there is another on the way. They are assisted in food shopping by a former Cambodian refugee.

At the time of the first BPA visit to this household, the husband was in the process of painting a large sign to be used at the new Buddhist temple. (He was also present later at a gathering at the temple. It seems clear that this will be a focal point in this family's life.) The elaborate border design was his own creation; he is a gifted artist, though his usual medium is wood carving rather than painting. During the time that he was in the refugee camps, Mr. F sketched accurately and from memory some of the detailed designs found on the ancient Ankor Wat temple. He has used those designs in a number of carved statuettes. He also taught carving; his main problem is that he cannot obtain (and cannot afford to buy) wood of the quality he needs to produce fine sculptures. Though he produces some utilitarian objects such as lamp bases, his preference is traditional Cambodian or Buddhist statues. His immediate goal is to make enough money selling his work to buy better tools, including some power tools. These are used only in the initial nondetailed carving steps, but they save a great deal of time.

Mr. F initially applied for several jobs unrelated to his skills, but was not hired because he had almost no English language skills. Resettlement agency staff mentioned the possibility of a job working for a manufacturer of fine furniture, in which he would be able to use his carving ability, though not his creativity. He seemed enthusiastic about such a job, because it would most likely pay more than the entry-level jobs he has applied for to date. Given his skill level, staff project that he should be able to support his family eventually, though the family is large and the wife will not be able to work for some time. In the long run, he would like to be able to support himself as an artist, perhaps teaching others his craft, and perhaps operating a small business where artworks are produced on a large enough scale to be lucrative. It is clear that his fellow refugees value his carvings highly, and that there is also a market for them among Americans. (He was able to purchase a color television with the proceeds from the sale of two of his carvings.) Meanwhile, agency staff did not push Mr. F too hard to accept employment. It was deemed better to retain Medicaid coverage until after the new baby is born.

However, by the time of the second BPA visit, Mr. F had been working for five months for an antique furniture dealer, restoring and refinishing wood furniture. He earns $5.00 per hour. While his work does not include carving, he has adapted his skills and is said to be doing well. Agency staff are currently following up on a lead to a possible job designing and carving stone. They decided not to tell Mr. F about this possibility unless it turns out to be a real one; for the moment, they have sent a resume on his behalf.

Mrs. F's new three-week old baby was healthy and strong. Mrs. F seemed very busy with all her children, but looked younger and happier than she had in many months.

This family is likely to become stable and self-supporting in the long run. They have not been in touch with the LDS missionaries, perhaps because their residence is not centrally located, and perhaps also because they are active in the Buddhist temple.

Case G originally consisted of a widow, aged 32, and her 14-year-old brother. Her husband died in 1976 in Cambodia, and all three of her children have died since. The whereabouts of her parents and three brothers and sisters are unknown; they were last seen in 1975. She never worked outside the home while in Cambodia, but in the refugee camps she was a teacher of young children. Her English language level was assessed at "C" in the processing center. They came to North Carolina in mid-February, and lived in the same household as another family. Living arrangements have changed since arrival in this country, as relationships among families within the household have not always been easy.

Within ten days after arrival, this case had been registered for AFDC and Food Stamps. Refugee cash assistance was at the level of $134 per month; the size of the Food Stamp allotment is unknown, since it was combined with that of another family.

About one month after arrival, it became known that the 14-year-old was not really the brother of this refugee, as he had claimed to be in order to get to this country. The whereabouts of her real brother were unknown, though he was believed to have been resettled in this country as an unaccompanied minor. The 14-year-old turned out to have an uncle in California whom he wanted to join. On March 12, 1983, he left North Carolina. More recently, almost by accident, it was discovered that her real brother had been "adopted" by the family of a doctor in another state and was living there happily. He was told that his sister is in North Carolina, but he does not seem anxious to leave his new home. She seems anxious to have him join her, but is not in a very good position to take care of him, and so no concrete steps are being taken at this time.

About one month after arrival, this refugee obtained her first job, a minimum wage job as a textile worker. However, she was having mental health problems (depression, suicidal) and lost the job after a month. After treatment of her depression, she obtained another similar job on June 16, but she quit that job after two weeks. She finally obtained a third job on July 26 in a textile factory where several of her FASP neighbors also work. This job appears to be going well, and it may be that she is finally approaching stable self-reliance.

Mrs. G has asked many times to be put in touch with her younger brother. The agency has had to keep his whereabouts a secret from her, in deference to his wishes and pending the consent of his foster parents. At the time of the second BPA visit, the agency and the ORR Regional Director had written to the brother's foster parents, explaining the situation and asking if they would agree to a telephone call that could possibly prove disruptive to their home life.

Family H consists of a 33-year-old man, his 37-year-old wife, and three sons, ages 11, 8, and 2. They arrived in North Carolina in late January. Mr. H had had ten years' education in Cambodia and was in the army prior to 1975. He then worked as a farmer until the time that the family escaped to Thailand in 1980. During their two-plus year stay in the refugee camps, Mr. H worked in the office.

Within two weeks after their arrival in North Carolina, the H family had settled into their own apartment and had signed up for refugee cash assistance and Food Stamps. Mr. H's search for employment was delayed for a few weeks because the CETA contractor was not well set up for serving refugees. After the resettlement agency hired an employment specialist, Mr. H was one of the first to be referred to a job, since he was anxious to work and support his family. His first job, as a dishwasher, lasted only two days. The wife of the owner was apparently not receptive to having a non-American worker, and forced her husband to dismiss Mr. H.

Within a few weeks, Mr. H had another minimum-wage job, this time moulding and handpainting small plaster statuettes. He did very well on this job, and his boss was pleased with his work. However, five weeks later, the plant was shut down, and Mr. H was again out of a job. Meanwhile, he had received a cash assistance check while he was employed, and thus had incurred an obligation to pay it back at the rate of $10 per month. Two months later, Mr. H finally had another job, this time paying $3.40 per hour. This job is in a huge lumber yard which supplies high-quality lumber to manufacturers of fine furniture. His principal responsibility is to stack lumber after it has been sorted by quality category. He has learned not only his own job, but also the whole range of related functions, so that sometimes when he is told which "grade" (and therefore which stack) a certain piece of lumber should go into, he disagrees with the "grader" -- and he turns out to be right. His boss says that Mr. H is a "good man," that if his English were better, he could run the entire operation. He will probably be promoted before long; he has already received a raise to $3.55 per hour. Still, Mr. H knows that even performing well on the job is not always enough to ensure job security and is mildly (though needlessly) concerned about the possibility of being laid off again.

At the time of the BPA site visit, the H family was living modestly in a very well-kept apartment. Mr. H was devoting a great deal of time to studying for his Driver Education class. He had written in the Khmer translation above each line of the text in the Driver Education manual. Mrs. H not only maintains her home and children with great care, but is also looked up to by the other Cambodian women as a terrific cook. She led their effort to cook a Cambodian meal for a Cambodian-American gathering at a local church.

Resettlement agency staff regard the H family as stable, responsible members of the community who, despite early difficulties, seem to be adapting well to life in North Carolina.

Case I consists of a 33-year-old widow and her two children, ages five and four. Until three years ago, she was a farmer, although she was able to get four years' education. During the time she was in the camp, she acquired considerable sewing skill. There was never any doubt on the part of the resettlement workers that she would be resettled successfully. She was employed very soon after arriving, having made arrangements to share an apartment with a woman who works a different shift from hers, so that her children are cared for while she is gone. She works the graveyard shift in a cookie factory for $4.60 per hour. She has a very good reputation for paying her bills on time.

Once her situation was stable, she asked resettlement agency staff if she could sponsor her boyfriend who was still in the camp. They told her about the strict agency policy of not providing reception and placement funding in such a case. They made it clear to the refugee that if he came to North Carolina, he would have to be her responsibility. He was resettled in Washington instead. Before long, though, he came to join her and they were married. The resettlement agency did agree to help him with employment. He received a job offer on one of their referrals and refused it. It was too far away, and he was anxious to work in the same cookie factory as his new wife. (This cookie factory is one of the best employers where the agency frequently places refugees.) He was told that if he refused a job, agency staff could not help him find another; he should take what they could get for him or find a job on his own. He became very angry, but he did start looking for another job. He found a job on his own and accepted it. He and agency staff are on better terms now.

This is a stable family that is likely to do very well. Their English skills are continually improving, their house is well-maintained, and the younger child has just been accepted in Head Start.

Case J consists of a single man who lives alone in one room of another refugee family's apartment. He is 54 years old, although his biodata lists his age as 45. He arrived in North Carolina in May. Mr J's English is excellent. He worked as a translator in the refugee camps in Thailand, and he served as a volunteer interpreter during the BPA interviews with refugee families. He had 11 years of education in Cambodia, more than nearly all other FASP refugees. He worked as a bank manager in Cambodia and has good accounting skills.

Mr. J's wife and children were lost and presumed dead in Cambodia. Resettlement agency caseworkers feel that he has not yet overcome the severe depression and guilt which resulted. He spent six years in refugee camps, waiting for his family to turn up. For a long time after arriving in the camps, he did not speak at all.

Mr. J for many months thought of himself as being too sick to work. He thought he had tuberculosis. In fact, he was initially placed on medical hold prior to being released from the refugee processing center, and took TB medication for six months there. Results of medical screening and tests indicated that he was healthy upon arrival in the United States. However, at the time of the first BPA site visit, he was not eating well. He was subsisting on his refugee cash assistance grant of $134 per month and his Food Stamps ($75). He spent most of his time alone in his room. A stack of encyclopedias stayed on the floor beside his bed; he said that he spent time reading them, though it appeared that he just looked at pictures and daydreams.

Six months later, Mr. J was stably employed. He found his job on his own, though it was in a factory in which several other FASP refugees were employed. It is said that the refugee children in his apartment complex, with home he spent many hours playing chess, were finally able to convince him that he should work. Mr. J still prefers to spend most of his free time alone. He lives from day to day, preferring not to plan for the future. However, he seems well settled in and almost completely adjusted to life in North Carolina.

Case K consists of a 43-year-old man, his 42-year-old wife, three daughters, ages 17, 11, and three, and two sons, ages 15 and seven. They arrived in North Carolina in mid-May, and were receiving cash assistance and Food Stamps within two weeks. Two months later, Mr. K had obtained a permanent job in a furniture manufacturing plant, though in the interim he had been successful in getting some odd jobs. His job pays minimum wage; it should improve soon, as he appears to be doing well. Meanwhile, the family gets along with the help of $276.00 per month in Food Stamps -- reduced from $398.00 before Mr. K began working.

The employment specialist describes Mr. K as "a cut-up"; he "talks 90 miles per hour" and gets along very well with his co-workers. He is, though, quite serious about doing well. He studies his English -- which is already quite good -- during his breaks at work. He is very independent ("Just show me how to do it once") and anxious to prove himself as a successful member of the local community.

Mr. L is 39 years old, Mrs. L is 33 years old, and their three sons are 13, seven, and one year old. Mr. L had four years' education in Cambodia, though he spent most of his early life on a farm. While he was in the refugee camps, he was trained as a carpenter. He also attended ESL classes for four months, but was assessed at only the "A" level upon departure for North Carolina.

The L family arrived in late March,and within a month, Mr. L had a good job which paid $4.00 per hour. His job was to make urethane foam to be used in furniture. Unfortunately, the chemicals severely aggravated his asthma and he had to be hospitalized on two occasions. The doctor advised him to change jobs. He resisted and tried alternatives, such as wearing a mask, but nothing helped. Finally, he had to resign.

Mr. L was out of work for about three months. He had turned down one job offer in a cafeteria because it wasn't full-time and didn't pay as well as his former job. Things got so desperate he had to hock his moped to pay the rent. He also borrowed money from one of the resettlement agency staff. Finally, he was forced to accept a janitorial job working evenings, less than full-time, at minimum wage. But soon afterward, he got another job as well, working for a manufacturer of leather products. He now works very hard at both these jobs, and has gotten back on his feet financially. In the meanwhile, he not only learned a valuable lesson (about not accepting a less-than-perfect job), but he taught the same lesson to many of his FASP friends.

Case M is a family of eight. The father is 55 years old, the mother is 35, and the children are 15, 13, four, three, two, and one year old. Mrs. M and the three-year old son are both blind in one eye. Mr. M. was in the military when he was much younger, but beginning in 1956, he worked as a stevedore (loading and unloading boats) for 19 years. After 1975, he was forced to work as a rice farmer by the Khmer Rouge. Several of his family died or were "taken away" during that time. Mr. M had no job at all during his three years in the refugee camps. No member of the family has had any formal education at all.

The M family arrived in North Carolina in mid-February. It took Mr. M six months to find a job working in a lumber yard for $3.40 per hour. That job lasted less than a month, because he could not do the work. The job did not require great strength or endurance, and it was not a particularly skilled job. It appears that Mr. M had trouble remembering instructions, even when things were explained to him in his own language. In fact, he has difficulty remembering how to get from place to place on his bicycle -- even after being shown two or three times.

The brighter side of the picture was that the M family was "adopted" by an American family who spends a great deal of time with them and takes care of transportation, food shopping, medical needs, and recreation. This American family arranged for donated furniture through their church, including a television set. Mrs. M is learning English slowly, and the older children appear to be doing well in school. In addition to refugee cash assistance and Food Stamps, the M family has a WIC supplement for the babies.

The only real difficulty facing this family was employment. The LFS employment specialist was discouraged by the first unsuccessful experience, and did not push Mr. M to look for another job for several months. However, one large employer who had hired several FASP refugees wanted more, so the employment specialist decided to refer Mr M. He was hired at $3.70 per hour and is performing extremely well on the job. It was reported that after only a month on the job, he had saved $900 - part of that was saved from his earlier cash assistance payments. The remaining challenge was to talk him into depositing his savings in the bank.

Mr. and Mrs. N are 46 and 38, respectively. They have a daughter ten years old and a son nine. Mr. N had four years' education in Cambodia and worked as a bus driver for 16 years. Neither Mr. nor Mrs. N is very proficient at English, however.

The N family arrived in North Carolina in mid-May. Within ten weeks they both had jobs; she was working in a furniture manufacturing plant where several other FASP refugees work, making $3.50 per hour. Mr. N accepted a job one week after she did doing maintenance work at minimum wage. He continued looking for another job, and at the time of the BPA site visit had just worked his first day at a leather products manufacturing plant where several of his friends work. He has kept both of his jobs, and the family is beginning to save some money. The employment specialist says that Mr. N's new boss is extremely impressed with his initiative and his obvious intelligence. The N family shows all the signs of becoming real leaders within the local Cambodian community.

Mr. and Mrs. O arrived in North Carolina in late June with their two daughters, ages 8 and 1, and two sons, ages 15 and 13. Mrs. O was pregnant with their fifth child. Mr. O was missing one eye. "They" had taken it, perhaps as a punishment for having seen something he shouldn't have seen, perhaps as a punishment for the fact that once upon a time he had been a soldier. After arrival, health screening brought to light the fact that Mrs. O had cervical cancer. Treatment for the disease resulted in the loss of the unborn child and left her with about a 50% chance of survival.

This family had become alienated from resettlement agency staff because of the influence of the LDS missionaries. However, staff continued to work with them, preparing Mr. O for restorative eye surgery and continuing to monitor Mrs. O's treatment and condition. One day Mr. O apologized to his case manager. He was tired of being disagreeable; he would like to be friends again. He said he had been afraid that agency staff wouldn't like his family because they were handicapped.

At the time of the second BPA visit, Mr. O's surgery was complete and he was fully recovered. Mrs. O was, by all reports, recovering and possibly cured. Mr. O was working at a temporary job using a machine in a textile factory. He was about to interview for a permanent job closer to home, and was very nervous about the interview. His difficulty speaking English was likely to cause a problem for this employer. Agency staff rehearsed over and over with him the questions the interviewer would ask and how he ought to respond. He became discouraged because he would work to understand one question, only to find he could not understand it if it were asked in a slightly different way. The solution was to write down the answers so that he could study them later in the evening. Staff were pleased to see that Mrs. O, sitting across the room, was taking an active interest in the role-playing session, sometimes participating when she succeeded in understanding a question before her husband did.

Mr. O was semi-successful in his job interview the next day. The employer decided to hire him, not for the immediate job, which would have required working independently, but as soon as an opening could be found on the later shift, where other FASP refugees with better English skills were already working.

Agency staff have one lingering concern about this family. When Mr. O begins his permanent job, there will be no medical insurance until he has been on the job for three months. They are keeping their fingers crossed that Mrs. O's condition will remain stable. They are also wishing that the Medicaid rules would allow for cases such as this.